DISPUTATION WITH CAMPION

1583

STC 18744.5

A true report of the Disputation or rather priuate Conference *had in the Tower of London, with* Ed. Campion Iesuite, the last of August. 1581. Set downe by the Reuerend learned men them selues that dealt therein.

Whereunto is ioyned also a true report of the other three dayes conferences had there with the same Iesuite. Which nowe are thought meete to be published in print by authoritie.

IMPRINTED AT LONDON
by Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie.
Ianuarij. 1. 1583.

To the Reader.

MAfter Campions Booke being at large answered shortly after our conference with him, which was concerning certaine points in the beginning of the sayd booke onely: and our sayd conference also, being partly remembred in the sayde answere of his booke, (though we had immediatly vpon the said conference, set downe in writing certaine notes of the same, out of our fresh memory to all euents:) Yet we thought there was no cause, the whole booke being confuted, why we should publish our dealing with him, concerning a fewe pointes in the beginning thereof onely, specially Master Campion being now dead, and not to replie thereunto himselfe: so that we layd aside our notes, and without all thought of any publishing of them at all. But there hauing bene sithen by others the fauourers of him and his cause partly in print, but in written Pamphlets much more dispersed, wherein Master Campions surmised glorious conqueſt against vs, is exceedingly set forth, and some of them so confidently, that in the conclusion thereof the Authour saithe: *The Catholikes by the iudgement of those that were not wedded wholy to will, did get the Goale.* And againe: *In my soule I protest, that in any indifferent iudgement, the aduerse protestaunts were quite confounded: and if I were not a Catholique already, the onely hearing of that conference, would haue made me one.*

Vpon such vntruthes and impudencie of such writers, we were partly of our selues enclined, and by the often and earnest exhortations of others importuned, and by some of great authoritie almost inforced to set downe the true report of the saide conference: whereby we trust that all those Catholiques, as they woulde be called, that haue any sparke of shamefastnesse left, may blush for Master Campions sake, being so manifestly deprehended in so many lyes so braggingly aduouched, and in print in the Latin tongue published to the worlde.

Surely we doe thinke our selues, and may say in trueth, that if we had bene so openly conuicted, so many wayes and in such sorte, as Master Campion then was: we should while we liued, be ashamed to shewe our faces. And we haue indeede heretofore, out of our fresh memories then, made reporte of diuers partes of this our conference vnto diuers persons as occasion hath serued, and not dissembled, that we found not Campion such a man, as by his challenge and booke, and other mens reportes of him we looked for: and that vpon this our conference with him, we verely thought the booke published in his name, to haue bene none of his. But by such Pamphlets as these be, and like reports by word, his surmised victories against vs were so speedily spread abroade, that diuers Gentlemen and others, neither vnlearned, nor of them selues euill affected, gaue not much credite to our sayings: of that value is the first report in some eares and heades, which hath among other things moued vs not a litle, to set downe at the last this our true report of our saide

conference, vpon hope, that trueth in time may take place. We doe knowe they will cauill at this, as our biting of a dead man, whome being aliue, they will say, we could not all marche. But the trueth is, we doe defende our selues against the backebitings of many slaunderous reporters, who doe yet liue and lurke in euery corner, by false reportes and writings continually indeuouring to suppresse, or at the least to blemish the trueth, vpon euery least occasion offered or sought. As first they began, so they continue. For whereas diuers of vs at diuers times had conference with Campion and his fellowes, the time being such, that so many of vs as could get leaue, when we had once conferred with him & his fellowes, departed into the countrey from whence we were called: and others remaining in the citie, assaying whether it might please God, that they coulde doe any good with them to their reformation: this was foorthwith by reportes and pamphlets euery where so framed and dispersed, as though Campion like some great beare, or Lyon rather (as they woulde haue him seeme) had shaken vs all off like cowardly curres one after another. But that religion can not long stand, that is vnderprop and stayed by such impudent lyes, as amongest many other things may well appeare to all, that with indifferencie, without foreiudgement, will reade and consider our true reporte of the sayd conference. Which why we haue not published it before, and why we doe publish it nowe, we haue shewed the true causes, howsoeuer they shall cauill, that vpon misliking of our parts we haue not published it hitherto, and find fault also that we haue published it nowe. Surely we with good conscience may affirme this our report, in the substance of matter to be most true, though our memorie could not alwayes retaine the order, or the very wordes wherein euery sentence was vttered.

A. Nowell. W. Daije.

A true report of the conference had with Campion and others, by the Deane of Paules and the Deane of Windsor, in the Tower of London the last of August, the 23. yere of the Queenes Maiestie, and of the Lord 1581.

WE the Deane of Paules and the Deane of Windsor (being sent to the Tower to haue conference with Master Campion and his fellowes in matters of Religion, and by order of Master Lieutenant, admitted into the Chappell of the Tower, whither the saide Campion and others were brought) shortly after our meeting, sayde to Master Campion, that wee came thither to the ende to doe him good, if it might please God to giue such good successe, howsoeuer hee or any other should thinke otherwise of vs. And because it should not seeme to him, that our meaning was to take any aduantage against him by our sudden comming to him, wee our selues being prepared for the Conference: wee sayd wee intended to deale with him in no other matters, then such as were conteined in his owne booke, by him so much studied, witten, and so lately published in print: wherein hee hauing made so large a Challenge as hee had, we saide, we thought hee could not thinke himselfe to be suddenly taken as vnprouided. Of which speach hee seemed not much to mislike, onely he said, that he vnderstoode not of our comming.

Then we beginning with the first part of his sayd booke, did demaunde of him with what reason he could charge the Queenes Maiesties most mercifull gouernement, and vs that at this time professe the Gospel (as he did in ỳ Preface of his said booke) with vnused and strange crueltie and tormentes, practised vpon his fellowes in religion: seeing that the Authors and professors of their Religion, had most cruelly burnt aliue, so many thousands of vs, for the maintenance of our Religion onely, besides diuers other

wayes of most horrible torments: where as none of them was euer executed for Religion, but either for treason, or some other notorious crime punishable with death by ẏ Lawes of ẏ Realme.

Whereunto he answered, that he was punished for Religion himselfe, and had bene twise on the Racke, and that racking was more grieuous then hanging, and that he had rather chuse to be hanged then racked.

Whereunto one of vs sayd, that belike Master Campion being the Popes tender Pernell, accounteth a litle racking of him selfe, to be more crueltie, then the roasting quicke of many thousands of vs.

You must (quoth Master Campion) consider the cause: the cause why, and not the punishment onely.

It hath bene euer your maner sayde we, not onely to vse *petitione principij*, but *totius* also: not only to require a principal point in controuersie, but euen ẏ whole it selfe to be graunted vnto you: as that your cause is good, and that you bee the true Church of Christ, as you continually presume and take vnto you. But thankes be to God, the contrarie hath bene so prooued, that a great part of Christendome doeth euidently see it. And many thousands, who were before of your Church, haue fled to vs from it, as from the synagogue of Antichrist. And concerning his racking, Master Lieutenant being present, sayde, that hee had no cause to complaine of racking, who had rather seene then felt the racke: and admonished him to vse good speache, that hee gaue not cause to be vsed with more seueritie. For although (said he) you were put to the racke, yet notwithstanding you were so fauourably vsed therein, as being taken off, you could, and did presently go thence to your lodging without helpe, and vse your handes in writing, and all other partes of your body: which you could not haue done, if you had bene put to that punishment, with any such extremitie as you speake of. Besides this, Master Beale one of the Clarkes of her Maiesties priuie Counsell, being by chaunce present, demaunded of him before all the companie there assembled, whether that being on the racke, he were examined vpon any point of Religion or no?

Whereunto hee answered, that hee was not in deede directly examined of Religion, but moued to confesse in what places he

had

had bene conuersant, since his repaire into the Realme.

Master Beale sayde, that this was required of him, because many of his fellowes, and by likelihood he himselfe also, had reconciled diuers of her Highnesse subiectes to the Romish Church, and had attempted to withdraw them from their obedience due to their naturall Prince and Soueraigne.

Whereunto he answered, that forasmuch as the Christians in olde time being commanded to deliuer vp the bookes of their Religion to such as persecuted them, refused so to doe, and misliked with them that did so, calling them *Traditores*: he might not betray his Catholike brethren, which were (as he sayd) the temples of the holy Ghost.

But it was replyed by Master Beale, that it was conuenient in policie for the Prince to vnderstande, what such as were sent from the Bishop of Rome (her Maiesties and the Realmes mortal enemie) did within her dominions: and to knowe her foes from her faithfull subiects, specially in such a time as this, wherein we liue: and that this inquirie did not touch the cause of Religion.

After this we came to the matter of his booke.

And first, where he chargeth vs that wee haue nowe of a sudden, cut off many goodly and principall partes of the holy Scriptures from the whole body thereof, of meere desperation and distrust in our cause (as hee writeth:) and for example and proofe thereof, he nameth first the Epistle of Saint James, which Luther, that flagitious Apostata (saith he) in the Preface of the same Epistle, and in his booke, *De captiuitate Babilonica*, nameth contentious, puffed vp, drie or barren, & as a thing stuffed with strawe, and iudgeth it vnworthie the Apostolique spirite: wee answered, that if Luther had so written, yet Master Campion did vs wrong, to charge vs with violating of the Maiestie of the holy Bible, for reiecting of the said Epistle of Saint James, who doe, and alwayes haue receyued the same Epistle. Yet wee prayed him that he woulde shewe these wordes, in the places by him noted: which he sayde he would, if he had the bookes. The booke, wherein was Luthers Preface to that Epistle being deliuered him, when he had read some part of the sayde Preface, and founde that Luther did allowe and commend that Epistle, as in deede he doeth, testifying, that though it were reiected of some

Flagitiosus Apostata. Contentiosam, turnidam, aridam, stramineam.

Lutherus in præfat. in epist. Iacobi. Hanc epistolam S. Iacobi laudo & pro vtili ac commoda habeo

olde writers, yet he commended it and tooke it to bee good and profitable: which wordes of Luther when Master Campion had read, he shut the booke and sayde, that it was not of the true edition.

We answered that the print was not lately published, being almost fourtie yeeres sithence, and that we had searched all other printes that we could come by, and found them to agree with this: and that we thought there was no other, and therefore we prayed him, that he would shew some edition wherein it was so set downe, as he alleaged it in his booke.

He sayde, he thought it was so as he had alleadged in the same booke of Luther in the Dutch tongue.

Then we offered to bring him the Dutch booke for the tryall of the trueth of the Latine translation: but hee refused to see the same. But it was auouched vnto him (as the trueth is in deede) that it was likewise in the Dutch booke, as he had read it in the Latine, for that we had made conference thereof.

Then he desired to see Luthers booke, *De captiuitate Babilonica*. This booke also we deliuered to him, and desired that he would shewe those wordes there. He read the wordes in Latine, which are these in effect: I passe ouer (sayth Luther) that many doe very probably affirme, that this Epistle is not Saint Iames the Apostles, nor worthie the Apostolike spirite. Here Master Campion thought that he had founde at the least, that Luther had sayde, that the sayde Epistle, was not worthie the Apostolike spirit.

But wee prayed him to consider, that Luther spake of other mens iudgement, and not of his owne, as in the same place is most euident to see: and also before in his Preface to that Epistle he expressly deuideth his iudgement from theirs.

But Master Campion much vrged the wordes (very probably) whereby sayeth he, Luther shewed his allowance of their iudgement.

We answered, that he so sayde, for that they brought very probable reasons for that their iudgement. But hee still charged Luther with blasphemie, for saying that some doe very probably affirme, that the Epistle of Iames, was not writ-

ten

ten by the Apostle Saint James, nor worthie the spirite of an Apostle, and urged vs to answere what opinion we had of that Epistle, meaning to intangle vs with that Dilemma either to condemne Luther, or else to doubt of the Epistle, as Luther saith that some probably do.

Wee answered that our Church doubteth not of that Epistle, but receiueth it as Canonicall, readeth it in our Churches, expoundeth it in our schooles, and alleadgeth it for confirmation of doctrine. Notwithstanding for Luther or any other to say, that some haue very probably affirmed that Epistle not to bee written by Saint James, nor to be worthie the spirite of an Apostle, is no blasphemie.

It is blasphemie, blasphemie (quoth he) pronoũcing those words with disdainefull countenance and voyce.

It is soone sayd (quoth we) but not so easily proued.

I will proue it (quoth he) to be blasphemie by two reasons, and thus he framed a Syllogisme.

The Gospel of Saint John, and the Epistle of Saint James, were written by the same spirite:

But to say that some do probably affirme the Gospel of Saint John not to be written by Saint John, nor to be worthie the spirit of an Apostle, is blasphemie:

Therefore to say ꝑ like of Saint James Epistle, is blasphemy.

Answere was made that the Maior was *Petitio principij*, the challenging of the graunt of that which chiefly is in controuersie. For those that so say of Saint James Epistle, doubt whether it was written by the same Spirite, that the Gospel of Saint John was or no: and that still resteth for you to proue sayd we.

And here Master Campion when he coulde not denie, that he required that to be graunted to him, which he should haue proued, was put to silence, and had no more to replie.

Then was his second reason called for, but none could be found.

Then sayde one of them, Why, is not Saint James Epistle called the Catholike Epistle of Saint James? How do you then denie it to be Canonicall?

It was saide, that that was a simple reason. For whereas other Epistles of the Apostles, were written vnto special Cities, people or persons: this of Saint James, for that it was written com-

monly to all the tribes of the Iewes dispersed, was called Catholike or generall.

Then sayde we to the auditorie: You haue heard that Luther doeth much commend this Epistle of Saint James, as good and profitable: and Master Campion allcadgeth, that he calleth it contentious, puffed vp, drie or barren, stuffed with strawe, and vnworthie the Apostolike spirit. Whereby (sayd we) ye may see the diuersitie or rather contrarietie of Luthers wordes, and Master Campions report, and so may ye iudge of his synceritie and trueth, which he vseth likewise continually.

Then sayd Master Campion, that Luther himselfe and others had purged these workes, and taken away all such places as that was, and the like that ministred such occasions of offence as that did: and he sayd he would procure from the Emperours Maiestie, and the Duke of Bauaria, and from another Prince (whose name we remember not) the true copies of those bookes to be sent to the Queenes Maiestie. Which wordes he (rising vp from the forme whereon he sate) pronoūced with so great contention of voyce, and with such gesture, casting vp his armes, & beating vpon his booke, that one of vs challenged him therefore, demaunding why he vsed such outragious speach and behaviour?

He answered, for that so many yong Catholiques were present there, he would not by any faynt defending of the cause, giue them occasion of offence.

Whereby we vnderstande, howe he woulde haue behaued himselfe, might he haue obtained a disputation among the youth of the Vniuersities, trusting they would be caryed away many of them by such his bolde and confident dealings and actions.

And we sayde further to Master Campion, that if Luther had purged his bookes, & where he first reiected Saint James Epistle (as Master Campion sayeth) he hath sithen receyued and much commended it: with what reason hath Master Campion charged vs vpon his surmise of Luthers first writing, which doth no where appeare as reiecting Saint James Epistle? He shoulde rather haue commended vs, who doe and alwayes haue allowed of that Epistle, and should haue praysed Luther, who after the example of Saint Augustine (and other ancient and godly writers) had amended in his writing that which vpon better aduise he misliked.

S. Aug. in his booke of retractations.

Then

Then we turning to the auditorie, said, that seeing all the printed Bookes of Luther extant, that we could finde, doe conteine such commendations of Saint James Epistle as they had heard, and that Master Campion hath charged Luther so contrarily to all his printed bookes, wherein hee commendeth that Epistle, and thereby also chargeth vs as reiecting it, who euer haue receiued it: they might, we said, take Master Campions trueth and synceritie to be as it is, vntil he haue brought out his copies from the Emperour and the Duke of Bauaria, which he nor any liuing we beleeue can euer doe.

But Master Campion said, that might he haue his own bookes from Drefordе, he would shewe that in Luther, which he had written of him.

Whereunto it was answered, that if hee woulde let vs knowe where they were, we would become humble suters to their honors, that he might both enioye his bookes, and that the partie who had them in keeping might be without daunger. But this woulde he not consent vnto.

Then Hart one of his fellowes saide, that hee being at Rome, heard Bellarminus the reader of controuersies there affirme, that the words reported by Campion in his booke were in that preface of Luther, and that therefore vpon his worde it was so.

Whereunto we answered, that neither his wordes, nor the testimonie of Bellarminus were of sufficient credite to carry away such a matter as that was without better proofe, specially so many and most manifest proofes in Luthers printed bookes being to the contrarie, who agreeth with vs in allowing the said Epistle, and that therefore Master Campion hath most impudently alleadged this place of Luther, as a proofe that we should reiect S. Iames Epistle.

Then Master Beale saide, It is not materiall to vs, if Luther had once so written: but he asked Master Campion whether euer he did reade him selfe any such words in Luther, as he in his booke doeth charge him with, or not?

Whereto he answered, that in a treatise made by Doctor Lee, sometime Archbishop of Yorke, against that booke of Luther intituled *De captiuitate Babilonica*, he had read these wordes alleadged, as he had set them downe in his booke.

Being againe asked, whether either vpon his othe, or vpon his credit,

credit, he would say to the presence there assembled, that hee had euer seene the places alleaged by him in his booke: and whether he knew them to be true?

Hee answered, that he wrote his booke as he trauelled, and that he coulde not, we knewe, carie a librarie about with him, and therefore he was forced to giue credite to his notes.

We said it was more credible, that he brought the said booke ouer with him, readie framed by the common and long conference of him selfe, and his fellowe Iesuites at conuenient opportunitie suddenly to be published, rather then ꝑ he did write it in his trauels, hauing so much besides to do, & being destitute of his librarie as he said, which is the vsual maner (as we said) of you al, hūting thereby for popular praise of speedie writing. But when & howsoeuer you did write your booke said we, you haue vsed ouermuch boldnes, so cōfidently to publish in print these slaūderous reportes of such men as you haue named, being not able to make any proofe of ꝑ, whereof you accuse them. And vpon these such good groundes of yours, you doe most vnreasonably and vntruly charge vs all, as those that haue rased, mangled and spoyled the body of the holy Bible.

The third testimonie or proofe alleaged against vs by Master Campion in his booke, is taken out of the Centuries, written by Illiricus, and others: which booke being giuen into his handes, and the like demaūde made as before, he would neither reade, nor once open the booke, neither yet made he any answere therto, knowing that he could make no exception to the print, as he did before to Luthers bookes, seeing that booke was neuer printed but once.

And besides, where they as Hystoriographers, had only set down the iudgements of S. Hierome, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and of other ancient fathers concerning this Epistle of Saint Iames, of Tobias, the bookes of Macchabees, &c: he knewe that he could not thereby proue his assertion, that they suddenly cut away so many goodly partes of the holy Bible, much lesse that we had so done, as he doth in his booke charge vs. For which causes chiefly, he would not as much as once open those bookes, and for the same cause, he woulde not looke vpon Kemnisius, whome, and vs by him, he had likewise falsely charged.

Whē Master Campion could not shew these words, out of any of those bookes by him alleaged, nor any good matter to proue thē,

nor

nor vs suddenly to haue rased, mangled and spoyled the holy Scriptures, as he chargeth vs of desperation in our cause to haue done: then did we shewe him, that we had not nowe suddenly (as he vntruely reported) cut off any part or line of the body of the holy Scriptures, but made onely a difference betweene those bookes of the Scriptures, that be commonly called Canonical, and of all men be taken for vndoubtedly true, from those that haue bene long ago suspected of many, and are called *Apocrypha*, according as was before set downe by the ancient Doctors of the Church, aboue a thousand yeres since & more. And for the proofe hereof, we alleaged the testimonie of Saint Hierome, *In Catalogo Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*, where he thus writes of the Epistle of Saint Iames named by Master Campion: The Epistle of Saint Iames, is sayde to be published, by some other man vnder his name. And of the second Epistle of Saint Peter he saith in the same booke, that it is denyed of many to be his, by reason of the difference of the stile. S. Hieromes wordes.

To this, Master Campion answered, that Hierome spake not of his owne iudgement, but reported what others said of them.

We answered, if Saint Hierome so reported of other mens sayings of those Epistles, and did not him selfe gainesay it, that it was a manifest token, that he did not greatly mislike their sayings. And seeing in S. Hieromes time and before, those Epistles were doubted of, you doe vs great wrong, sayde we, to charge vs that we haue suddenly cut them off from the body of the Bible, who in deede notwithstanding the former doubts of them, gladly receiue and allowe them. We alleaged againe S. Hierome, *In Prologo Galeato, & Epistola ad Paulinum*, where he sheweth his owne iudgement, what bookes of the Scriptures of the old Testament are to be taken for Canonicall, and which haue bene doubted of: which Epistles (quoth we) haue bene written & printed in all Bibles, by the space of these thousande yeres and more, to warne all readers of that difference of the said *Apocrypha*, frō the true Canonicall: and to arme them as it were against the errour of confounding the Canonical Scriptures with these *Apocrypha*: for the which cause as it seemeth, he also nameth that Prologue *Galeatum*, as an helmet for defence against that error.

But nowe sithence the Tridentine Councill, some Popish prin-
ters haue left out the said Prologue and Epistle of S.Hierome,
who yet declareth this his iudgement likewise, in his Preface to
the first booke of Esdras also.

Sherwin one of Master Campions fellowes, answered to
these allegations, that Hierome did *Iudaizare*, and more was not
said to these places.

We also alleaged Eusebius, who hauing made rehearsall of
those bookes of the newe Testament, which be vndoubtedly true,
nameth also such as were gainesaid, and writes thus: *Quibus ve-*
Euseb. libro 3. cap. 25. *ro contradicitur, &c.* those bookes that are gainesaide, though
Euseb. libr. 2. Ep. 23. they be knowen to many, be these: The Epistle which is attribu-
ted to Saint Iames, the Epistle of Iude, the latter of Peter, & the
seconde and thirde of Iohn. And the same Eusebius in another
Adulterinam. place affirmeth plainly, the said Epistle of S.Iames, to be a coun-
terfaite or bastard Epistle.

To this authoritie they said that it was true that he so said, and
as we alleaged them, and that when he wrote, it was lawfull for
any man to doubt of those bookes, that he called Apocrypha: but
seeing by the Church (that was by the Councill of Carthage, and
now also by the Council of Trident) they were receiued for Ca-
nonicall, it was blasphemie, they saide, to doubt of the authoritie
of those bookes.

To that was replied, that the Synode of Laodicea, held them
for Apocrypha.

Yea said they, but that Synode was not generall.

No more was that of Carthage said we.

No saide they, but that of Carthage was after confirmed by a
generall Councill in Trullo.

So was (quoth we) the Synode of Laodicea, which held thē
for Apocrypha, confirmed also by the same generall Councill in
Trullo, as there is to be seene. But how doeth this agree, that not
long before you did say absolutely, that S.Iames epistle was writ-
ten by the same spirit that S.Iohns Gospel was written with, and
now you ground the credit of S.Iames Epistle and the other vpō
these Councils?

But said we, these Councils had no authority to make any ma-
ner writings Canonical, that was not before Canonical. For, by
the

the iudgemēt of S. Augustine in many places of his bookes, there are two things requisite to proue any writing Canonical: one is the testimonie of the Church, in which the authour liued when he wrote: The other is the continuall contestation of the Churches succeeding. To this effect writeth S. Augustine: and so be all latter Churches barred from authority to make any writings canonicall scripture, specially those that haue of olde bene doubted of. They may testifie what the olde Churches before them haue done, as we nowe doe. *Augustin. contra Faustum. lib. 28. cap. 2. & lib. 33. cap. 6.*

Hereunto they said againe, that it was blasphemie after those Councils to call those bookes *Apocrypha*, or to doubt of the authoritie of them.

It is rather most horrible blasphemie said we, to make humane writings equall with the Canonicall scriptures, (as of late your Tridentine Councill hath done, and as your Pope being but one man hath made his Decretal epistles) then with S. Hierome, Eusebius, and other ancient godly fathers, to cal those bookes *Apocrypha*, which they do so call. *Distinct. 19. cap. In Canonicis.*

And we said, that notwithstanding those Councils, Caietanus their Popes Cardinall thought it no blasphemie, who in the end of his expositions vpon the olde testament, in very plaine wordes, maketh the same differēce of the bookes of the scriptures, & doth not onely allowe the iudgement of Hierome, but addeth further, that all writings, yea of bishops of Rome them selues, of whome he nameth some, must be brought to S. Hieromes rule. *Ad limam Hieronimi.*

They vtterly reiected Cardinall Caietanus, because (as they said) he was but one man against all the Church.

We said, you of your side will not be charged with the words of others, though they be the Popes Cardinals, and yet you doe thinke it reason, that we should be charged with euery word, that hath slipped from Luther. May you charge him, and vs by him, with that which you can neuer proue, that he did write or speake.

Hart saide further, that Caietanus was a good scholeman and traueled in that course with commendation: but when he began to become an expositor of the scriptures, saide he, then he lost his grace and credit.

We answered, if they thought it reason to charge vs with all the sayings of Luther, or of any other: we might by good & great

reason, charge thē with the sayings of so great & learned a Cardinall of Rome, as Caietanus was. Last of all, we came to the place of S. Augustine in his second booke *De doctrina Christiana*. Which Campion and his fellowes gladly receiued, because they said, it made for them and not for vs. For, said they, S. Augustine rehearseth those bookes for Canonicall scriptures, which you call *Apocrypha*.

Augusti. de doctrina Christiana. lib. 2. ca. 8

To this we answered, that they should rather charge Saint Hierome and Eusebius, and other ancient fathers, who doe call them *Apocrypha*. And S. Augustine in that place rehearsing the order of the bookes of scriptures, though, said we, he differ somwhat from Eusebius and S. Hierome in shewe of wordes: yet he doeth in deede agree with them. For where they deuide the bookes of the scriptures into three sorts, that is, Canonical, Apocrypha and feigned or vntrue: Augustine deuideth them into Canonical and Apocrypha onely: and then he deuideth the Canonical bookes into two sorts, that is, those that be certainly true (which we with S. Hierome and Eusebius, do call properly Canonicall) and those that haue bene doubted of, which Eusebius and S. Hierome do call *Apocrypha*. And S. Augustine nameth those ẏ be vtterly vntrue, *Apocrypha*, which Eusebius calleth doubtfull, feigned and forged. And this may be gathered out of Augustine him selfe in diuers places, whereof we haue noted some. And albeit Augustine calleth those bookes Canonical, yet he giueth not the like authoritie to them, as namely to the Maccabees, & to the other of that sorte, as he doeth to those that be Christs the Lords witnesses, as he nameth them, which be these that are named properly Canonicall. Here would they not admit in any wise, that the word Canonical was *æquiuocum*, or of diuers significations in diuers places: but that whersoeuer that worde was founde, it brought all bookes so called, vnder one kinde. Much time was spent hereabout, and the matter was much argued on Master Campion and his fellowes part. At the last Master Campion was desired by vs, to reade the chapter in ẏ Canon law, beginning *In Canonicis*, which Gratian takes out of this place of Augustine: and first, that hee would reade the rubrick, which he seemed loth to do. And Pound one of his companions sitting by (who with his importunitie & impertinent speaches, had often interrupted the course of the cō-

Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 25. dubia, ficta, adulterina.

Augusti. de Ciuit. Dei. libr. 15. cap. 23. & contra 2. Gaudent. Epist. lib. 2. cap. 23.

Testes Domini.

Distinct. 19. cap. In Canonicis.

ference)

ference) sayde, Father Campion, let them reade their places themselues. Yet at the length, Master Campion read it, and it is thus. *Inter Canonicas scripturas, Decretales Epistolæ connumerantur;* which after much desiring he englished also. The decretall Epistles are numbred together among the Canonicall Scriptures.

Whereupon one of vs sayde, you charge vs with blasphemie, for naming those bookes *Apocrypha*, which Saint Hierome, Eusebius, and other ancient holy fathers doe so name: but here may you see most horrible blasphemie in deede, in the Canonical lawe of your Pope, which matcheth his Decretall epistles (that is mere fables) with the Maiestie of the Canonicall Scriptures, as he doeth in this distinction, and sundry other places, whereby you may see to what poynt this boldnesse of making mens writings Canonicall Scriptures is come.

Then saide we to M. Campion, do you hold ỹ Popes decrees for Canonicall scriptures: as you doe the bookes of Moyses and the Prophets?

He answered, No: and graunted then that the word Canonicall, was æquiuocum or of diuers significations, which before, they all did so constantly denie.

Whereupon we sayde that we had some good hope of Master Campion, for that he blushed. And we sayde further, that Cardinall Caietanus in the place before alleadged, saieth expressely, that S. Augustine placed those books in the Canon of maners, but not in the Canon of doctrine, whereby he plainely declareth that the word Canonicall is æquiuocum.

After this, he was desired to reade the text of that Chapter, and there he found & coulde not denie, but that the place of Augustine was vntruely reported by Gratian, and by manifest corruption drawẽ altogether from the meaning of Augustine. For where S. Augustine saith, that those Scriptures are to be taken for Canonicall, which the most or greatest part of Christian Churches so take, among the which those Churches be, which deserued to haue Apostolique Seas, and to receiue Epistles from the Apostles: these wordes of Saint Augustine are chaunged, and in the place of the Apostolique Seas, is put the Apostolique Sea, (meaning the Church of Rome) and those Churches which deserued to receaue Epistles from the said Church of Rome: which is

S. Augustines wordes.

The report of them. *Distinct. 19. Cap. de Canonicis.*

cleane contrary to S. Augustines wordes and meaning.

Both often before, and here specially, Master Campion and his fellowes seemed to be desirous to dispute vpon some poynts of religion, rather then to continue in this examination of his booke, which we said we would not at after noone refuse, but the forenoone (qd we) is so farre spēt, that we must at this time make an ende. And then turning vs to the auditorie, wee sayde: You haue heard howe Master Campion in his printed booke, hath charged vs as rasers, manglers and spoylers of the holy Scriptures, of meere desperation and distrust in our cause, as he saith. You haue heard how he would proue vs so to be, by certayne places by him in his said printed booke noted, as being the wordes of Luther and others in their bookes. You haue heard and seene proued by the bookes themselues, that there is no such thing to bee founde in those places of their bookes as hee hath set downe: but onely that Saint Hierome, and Eusebius aboue a thousande yeere sithen, doubted of the authoritie of those Epistles & bookes. And you haue heard, and it is vniuersally knowen, that S. Hieroms Prologue and Epistle, wherein hee noteth those bookes to bee *Apocrypha*, haue bene ioyned with all Bibles that haue bene written and printed euer since S. Hieromes time, by the space of a vi. hundred yeeres and more, vntill nowe of late sithen the Tridētine Councill, some Popish Printers haue left them out. And you haue heard, that not onely nowe of late, the Councill Tridentine hath made the *Apocrypha* of equall authoritie wt the vndoubted Canonical scriptures: but also that it is set downe in the B. of Romes Canon law, ỹ his Decretal epistles are to be nūbred together among ỹ Canonical scriptures: & so finally you see what iniurie these mē do thēselues to the holy scriptures, & what blasphemy they haue cōmitted, in matching their fables wt the Canonical scriptures, who do most vniustly charge vs wt those crimes.

Hierom. Prolog. Galeat. & epistola ad Paulinum.

Sherwin saide, but you should haue told withall, what we haue answered to all those poynts.

We said, your answere is to be looked for, when you can bring foorth your copies which you speake of, and promised: for in any bookes by you named, & extant and to be had, there is nothing of that which M. Campion hath set downe to be founde. And here the time being spent we made an end for ỹ forenoones cōference.

The

The after noones conference.

IN the foꝛe noones conference both Maſter Campion him ſelfe, & others of his companions, had oftentimes required vs that wee woulde deale with them in ſome matter of doctrine, and leaue that courſe that we began with, in the examining of his booke.

Whereunto we anſwered, that we were minded (if the time would ſuffer vs) to examine other partes of his booke, and lay it open to the audience there, howe that as he had moſt vntruly charged Luther and others, with the mangling and ſpoyling of the body of the holy Scriptures in the beginning of his booke: ſo had hee likewiſe moſt vntruly and impudently in other places ſlaundered other woꝛthie men: and vpon the ſame his good groundes, he had charged vs all, as raſers and manglers of the holy Scriptures. And ſurely our opinion was, that if any thing at all, that laying open befoꝛe his face of his continuall vntrueths, which hee hath ſo bꝛaggingly aduouched in his booke myght haue reclaymed him. Foꝛ vndoubtedly hee coulde neuer haue endured the manifeſtation of thoſe his lyes, as they were in the confutation of his booke ſhoꝛtly after ſet out, had they bene layde open befoꝛe his eyes: which myght manifeſtly appeare to all that dyd marke his gentle and milde behauiour and ſpeache in the After noones conference, in compariſon of his bꝛagging and lowde woꝛdes vſed in the foꝛenoone.

Notwithſtanding at our meeting at after noone, we layde vnto Maſter Campion, ſeeing your deſire is ſo much to diſpute in ſome matter of doctrine, wee will not refuſe. But firſt wee pꝛay you, let vs (qd we) peruſe the Canon that foloweth, that which we laſt dealt with in the foꝛe noone concerning the Popes Canons,

and the Canonicall Scriptures, for that the time would not then suffer vs to reape it. The wordes of Pope Leo the fourth, there translated word for word, are these: For this cause I feare not to pronounce more plainely and with a loude voyce, that he that is conuinced not to receiue indifferently the statutes of the holy fathers (which we haue spoken of before) which with vs are intituled by the name of Canons, whether he be a Bishop, a Clarke, or a laie man, that he is proued neither to beleeue, nor to holde profitably and effectually to his effect, the Catholique and Apostolique faith, nor the foure holy Gospels. This saith Pope Leo. You may see, (quoth we) whereunto this boldnesse of matching mens writings with the holy Canonical Scriptures, is come. For here, Pope Leo with a loude voyce pronounceth, that whosoeuer doeth not indifferently receiue ỹ Canons, is conuicted, neither to reteine effectually, nor beleue the Catholique & apostolique faith, nor the foure holy Gospels: whereby hee matcheth the beleeuing, receiuing, or refusing of his Canons, with the beleeuing or refusing of the foure holy Gospels: for so we said that the processe of that Canon, and the word indifferently did import.

Distinct. 20. *Cap. De libellis* The Pamphleter here saith, that M. Day (meaning the Deane of Windsor) hauing belike of olde store an other Canon to reade &c. But the trueth is, their affirming the word Canonicall to make all writings so named to be of equall authoritie, occasioned vs to reade that Canon before. *Distinct.* 19. *Cap. In Canonicis* The Decretal Epistles are together numbred with the Canonicall Scriptures. To the which if you ioyne the saying of Pope Agatho. *Distinct.* 19. *Cap. Sic Omnes*, which is neere to it. All the Sanctions of the Apostolique Sea, are to be taken as established by the deuine voyce of Peter himselfe saith Pope Agatho. Whereunto if you adde this also, which Pope Leo *magna voce*, w a great voice saith here, would you not thinke that Sathan or *Beelzebub* bellowed out most horrible blasphemies? for euen as Lucifer by pride woulde haue made himselfe, equall with God: so this Lucifers vicar in earth, would by a Luciferian pride make his worde, Canons and writings, equall with the Maiestie of Gods worde, and the Canonicall Scriptures.

Master Campion indeuoured very much to qualifie this worde *indifferenter*, indifferently, and so to moliffe the Popes blasphemie if hee coulde: and hee confessed that there was difference betweene the Euangelistes and other writers, for that the Euangelistes and writers of the Scriptures coulde not erre in memorie or any other circumstance, but Councils might bee deceiued in some such small matters of circumstance. As for example, sayeth hee, I am bounde vnder payne of damnation to beleeue, that *Tobias* dogge had a tayle, because it is written he wagged his tayle.

It was said by vs, that it became him not to deale so triflingly

in matters

in matters of such waight.

Why then, saith he, if this example like you not, take another. I must beleeue that Saint Paul had a cloake, because he willeth Timothie to bring his cloake.

We saide, these things were nothing to purpose, vnlesse hee coulde proue, that such a promise was made to ỹ bishop of Rome & his Councils, that whatsoeuer they should determine, was sure to be true and certaine.

They alleaged Christes saying: He that heareth not the Church, let him be reputed as a publicane and heathen. Matth. 18.

We answered, that text serued them for all purposes. But first they must proue thẽ selues to be the true Church before that text would belõg vnto them. And where they alleaged out of the 15. of the Actes, So it seemeth to the holy Ghost and vs: we answered, we knewe well enough that that Councill was gouerned by the holy Ghost, wherein the Apostles were president. But what maketh that to the wicked Councils of Popes? And after much reasoning about the worde *indifferenter*, we said, were that word put out, yet were it blasphemie to say, that he that beleeueth not the Popes Canons (which are with other there mentioned) beleeueth not the foure holy Gospels. After this we begã our disputation cõcerning iustification, both for that it is first of al other mentioned in your booke (quoth we to Master Campion:) and both Luther and we al, are most grieuously charged by you, with error therein: and also for that it is in deede a matter of the chiefest controuersie betweene vs. And first, for that you doe in your booke, vntruely charge Luther, and vs by him, with the cutting away of Saint Iames epistle, for that the wretch (as you say of Luther) was by this epistle vanquished and ouerthrowen, and for that, that epistle doeth so manifestly conuince his and our error in this matter of iustification (as you do write) we do protest that we will neither refuse, nor make any exception to that epistle of Saint Iames, nor to any other part of the newe Testament, which you vntruely haue charged vs to haue cut off from the body of the holy scriptures. Act. 15. *Miser. Confossus & diruptus.*

It is well, said they, that you doe receiue this Epistle of Saint Iames.

We haue euer receiued it, said we: Howe much the more vn-

truely, haue you charged vs with the contrarie? And so entring into the matter, we said, Whereas you do charge Luther, & with him vs all, for teaching a newe and false doctrine, yea heresie also, in that we say and write, that we are iustified by faith onely: we say for our defence against this your slaunder, that the same doctrine is taught, both in many places of ỹ holy scriptures most effectually, and is also expressely affirmed and pronounced by the ancient holy fathers and doctors of Christes Church, both Greekes and Latines, in the very same wordes that we do vse.

Let vs heare your scriptures and doctors said they.

Thē, for that we came purposed to examine ỹ vntrueths of Campions booke, rather then to dispute: we did very briefly, as our memorie did then serue vs, note rather then throughly alleage many places out of the holy scriptures, for the proofe of our iustification by faith, and consequently by faith onely, to this effect.

Our sauiour Christ saide we, as it is in sundry places of the Euangelists recorded, saith often: Thy faith hath saued thee. Onely beleeue, beleeue onely. They shall receiue remission of their sinnes, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. As many as beleeue in me, to them hath God giuen power, to become the sonnes of God. Whosoeuer beleeueth in me, shall not be condemned, shall not perish, but haue euerlasting life. Thus saith our sauiour Christ, &c. And Saint Paul saith, Beleeue in the Lord Iesus Christ, and thou shalt be saued. God doeth iustifie thorowe faith. We are saued by grace thorowe faith. We are blessed by faith. We are the children of Abraham, yea we are the children of God by faith. The righteousnesse of God by the faith of Iesus Christ vnto all, and vpon vs all that beleeue. If thou confesse with the mouth the Lord Iesus, and shalt beleeue in thine heart, that God raysed him vp from the dead, thou shalt be saued. For with the heart man beleeueth vnto righteousnes, and with the mouth man confesseth vnto saluation. We are freely iustified by his grace thorowe faith.

Matth. 9. Mark. 5. & 10. Luke 7. 8. & 12. and 18. Act. 26. 18. Iohn 1. 12. Iohn 3. 16. Actes 16. 31. Galat. 3. 8. Ephes. 2. 8. Rom. 4. Rom 3. 22. Rom. 10. 9. Rom. 3. 24.

Then said they, we knowe right well that the scriptures doe conteine great commendations of faith, but in all these there is not this word faith onely, which is your doctrine.

But the ancient holy fathers, said we, vpon these groundes of

the

the ſcriptures by vs alleaged, do gather and plainely pronounce, that onely faith iuſtifieth, as you ſhall heare anone. And howe many things ſayde we, doe you your ſelfe teach vs as neceſſary articles of religion, not hauing for you one plaine worde therefore, but doe affirme, that in effect they are conteined in the holy ſcriptures. And you haue heard that iuſtification and righteouſneſſe, yea, ſaluation and the kingdome of heauen, are attributed to faith, and that without any addition of any other thing. And you haue heard the wordes of our Sauiour: beleeue onely, only beleeue. And of Saint Paul, you are freely iuſtified by faith, which are in effect as much as faith onely, and to more effect exceedingly, then are your proofes of a great many of the principal pointes of your Popiſh religion. And where as we meane none other by faith onely, but faith without the workes of the Lawe, and without our good workes: if the former place can not ſatiſfie you, heare what Saint Paul ſayeth further. Knowe ye that a man is not iuſtified by the workes of the Lawe, but by the faith of Ieſus Chriſt. The righteouſneſſe of God is made manifeſt without the Lawe, by the faith of Ieſus Chriſt vnto al, and vpon all that beleeue. We holde that a man is iuſtified by faith, without the deedes of the Law. It is one God that iuſtifieth circumciſion by faith, and vncircumciſion through faith. Euery one that beleeueth is abſolued from all, from the which they could not be abſolued by the Lawe of Moſes. Thus ſaith Saint Paul, and to the like effect in exceeding many places, declaring that we are iuſtified by faith, and not by the Law, by faith and not by workes, which is all one as to ſay, by faith onely.

Gal. 2. 16.

Rom. 3. 21. 22. 28. 30. Act. 13.

No it is not all one, ſaid they.

But the ancient doctors of the Church ſaid we, do vpon theſe very places of the holy ſcriptures by vs alleaged, gather and in expreſſe wordes ſet downe, as we do, that we are iuſtified by faith onely, as ye ſhall ſee. Saint Hillary (quoth we) ſayeth thus, reading his wordes out of the booke it ſelfe, *Mouit ſcribas remiſſum ab homine peccatum: hominem enim tantum in Ieſu Chriſto contuebantur, & remiſſum ab eo quod lex laxare non poterat: fides enim ſola iuſtificat.* That is to ſay, It moued the ſcribes that ſinne was remitted by man: for they behelde man onely in Ieſus Chriſt, and that was remitted by him, the which the Lawe can

D. Hillarius in Matth. cap. 8.

Faith onely doeth iustifie.

not releaſe: for faith onely doeth iuſtifie. Thus farre Saint Hilary: who as you doe ſee of this doctrine of Saint Paul by vs alleadged for iuſtification by faith without the lawe, gathereth and ſetteth downe the ſame doctrine in the ſame wordes that we doe teach, that faith onely doeth iuſtifie.

But he ſaith not ſo in the ſame ſenſe that you doe, ſaith Maſter Campion.

We ſhall ſee of the ſenſe anon, ſaide we: but we pray you heare the other doctors alſo, who doe agree with vs in the ſame wordes. Saint Ambroſe alſo vpon the place by vs alleaged out of the third to the Romanes, among many other ſentences hath this, *Non iuſtificari hominem apud Deum niſi per fidem.* That a man is not iuſtified before God, but by faith. And ſhortly after Saint Ambroſe ſaith, *Tam Gentiles quam Iudeos, non aliter quam credentes iuſtificauit. Quia enim vnus Deus eſt, vna ratione omnes iuſtificauit.* That is, both the Gentiles and the Iewes God hath iuſtified none other wayes, but beleeuing. For, becauſe there is one God, he hath iuſtified all by one meanes. And moſt plainely vpon the wordes by vs before alleaged, he ſayeth, *Iuſtificati gratis per gratiam ipſius: Iuſtificati ſunt gratis, quia nihil operantes neq; vicem reddentes, ſola fide iuſtificati ſunt dono Dei.* That is, they were iuſtified freely by his grace: They were iuſtified freely for working nothing, neither making any recompence: they were iuſtified thorow only faith by the gift of God. Thus farre Saint Ambroſe, who doeth very often in his expoſitions vpon that Epiſtle to the Romanes repeate, That we are iuſtified by faith alone. And Saint Baſil moſt worthely named the great, ſayeth, Αὕτη γὰρ δὴ ἡ τελεία καὶ ὁλόκληρος καύχησις ἐν Θεῷ, ὅτε μήτε ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλ' ἐγνωκὼς μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωθέντα ἑαυτοῦ δικαιοσύνης ἀληθοῦς πίστει δὲ μόνῃ τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν δεδικαιωμένον, ᾗ καυχᾶται Παῦλος ἐπὶ τῷ καταφρονήσει τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δικαιοσύνης, &c. That is, perfect and ſounde reioyſing in God is this, when a mã doth not boaſt of his own righteouſnes, but knoweth that he wanteth him ſelfe true righteouſneſſe, and that he is iuſtified by only faith in Chriſt. And Saint Paul doeth glorie in the contempt of his owne righteouſneſſe. Thus farre Saint Baſill. And Gregorie Nazianzen ſaith, Ὁμολόγησον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ πίστευσον ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγαρται καὶ σωθήσῃ δικαιοσύνην μὲν γὰρ οἶδε τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον. Confeſſe Ieſus Chriſt, and beleeue that he is riſen from death, and thou ſhalt

D. Ambroſ. in cap. 4. & 9. ad Rom.

Rom. 3.

Baſil. Περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης. Πίστει μονῇ.

Gregor. Nazianzen. Περὶ ὑποταγῆς. Τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον.

ſhalt be ſaued: For to beleeue onely, is righteouſneſſe. Thus ſayth Nazianzen ſurnamed Theologus the deuine, for his excellent learning in the ſcriptures. And the ſame doctrine of iuſtification by faith alone, doe many other ancient, godly and learned fathers and doctors ſet downe moſt plainely in their woorkes. After that theſe ſayings of theſe ancient doctors were read, we ſaid, You ſee that this doctrine and the very woords themſelues, which we doe vſe, we are iuſtified by faith onely, or fayth onely doeth iuſtifie, are not any new inuention of ours, but are ſet downe and pronounced by many ancient and holy fathers of the Church, aboue a thouſand yeere ſithen and more, and that, being grounded euen vpon the ſame places of the holy Scriptures, that wee doe alleage for our iuſtification by faith onely.

Athan. in Galat. 3. Chriſoſt. in Hom. 2 in Rom. Origen. in Rom. cap. 3.

Maſter Campion ſaide, but thoſe Doctors and you doe not agree in ſenſe, as I ſaide before.

It is well ſaide we, that you can not denie but that they doe agree with vs in woordes, and that they doe gather theſe woordes euen of the ſame ſcriptures, which we alleadged for onely faith to iuſtifie: and that therefore theſe woordes, wee are iuſtified freely thorow grace by faith: faith without the law, without the works of the lawe doeth iuſtifie, (which are the woordes of Saint Paul) are all one with theſe woordes, faith only doth iuſtifie, which was before by you denied.

Maſter Campion ſaide, but the trueth of the matter reſteth in the ſenſe and meaning of the Doctors.

What ſenſe is it that you doe ſpeake of? ſaide we.

Maſter Campion anſwered, We do graunt that it is true that onely Faith doeth iuſtifie, in this ſenſe, that is, that when we be firſt brought into the ſtate of grace, no good woorkes do go before *primam gratiam* the firſt grace of iuſtification, but that our firſt iuſtificatiõ is by faith only, without any woorkes going before: but the woorkes that followe the firſt grace and iuſtification (ſaid Maſter Campion) doe both iuſtifie and merite alſo.

We alleadged Saint Auguſtines ſaying, *Opera non præcedunt iuſtificandum, ſed ſequuntur iuſtificatum:* Workes do not preceede a man to be iuſtified, but doe followe him being iuſtified.

Auguſt. de fide & operibus.

That is true, ſaid Maſter Campion, as I ſaid before, of the firſt grace and iuſtification: but good woorkes doe goe before the ſe-

cond iustification.

It is but a small matter (said we) to graunt ỹ no good woꝛkes doe go beꝺoꝛe the first grace oꝛ iustification, when beꝺoꝛe the same grace there can be no good woꝛkes at all. And concerning the seconde iustification, we replyed to that, that Saint Paul speaking of that iustification, and alleadging the example and saying of king Dauid theꝛefoꝛe, sayeth expꝛessely, that to a man that doeth beleeue in him that doeth iustifie the wicked, his fayth is reputed to righteousnes, according to the purpose of the grace of God. Euen as Dauid setteth downe the blessednesse of a man, vnto whome God reputeth righteousnesse without woꝛkes. Blessed are they whose wickednesse is pardoned, and whose sinnes are couered, &c. Thus sayeth Saint Paul, thus sayth the King and Pꝛophet Dauid, teaching playnely that our iustification is by Gods pardoning of our euill woꝛkes, and not by the merites of our good woꝛkes: foꝛ he sayth expꝛessely, that iustice is without our woꝛkes. And S. Paul and King Dauid were in the state of grace when they did thus wꝛite, and yet doe shewe that their iustification then, as well as beꝺoꝛe, was without woꝛkes.

Rom. 4.

Psalm. 32.

Master Campion saide, a man being in the state of grace, may wꝛite of the first grace and iustification, why not? and so did they in that place.

Yea (quoth we) but if he be set downe foꝛ an example himselfe, after that hee hath obteined the first grace and continued therein, and yet sayth that God reputeth his iustification without any his woꝛkes, though he haue done many good, as Abꝛaham first, and then Dauid are here set out foꝛ example: and as Saint Basill, as was beꝺoꝛe alleaged, setteth out Saint Paul him selfe foꝛ an example, who doeth gloꝛie in the contempt of his owne righteousnesse: it is euident, that that iustification oꝛ righteousnesse which is beꝺoꝛe God, is without any woꝛkes of ours at all, and that all iustification of all persons, and in all times, is by the grace of God thꝛough faith onely, without any merite of our woꝛkes.

D. Basil. de Humilitate.

Then they alleadged Saint Iames woꝛdes, Faith without charitie is dead, making thereby charitie the soule and life of faith.

Hereunto wee made answere, that fayth without charitie was in deede dead, and altogether vaine and vnpꝛofitable. But Saint Iames meaning herein, was not to make charitie the pꝛincipall

part,

part, or the forme of fayth : but onely to shewe, that by charitie faith is approued and declared to be a true & a liuely faith, which wee doe most willing graunt. And therewith wee alleaged the saying of Thomas *de Aquin.* being a scholeman of their owne side, who saith, *Deus iustificat effectiuè: fides iustificat apprehensiuè: opera iustificant declaratiuè.* That is, God doth iustifie effectually, faith doeth iustifie apprehendingly, workes do iustifie declaringly.

Master Sherwin saide it was *Fides iustificat instrumentaliter*, Faith iustifieth instrumentally.

That worde (quoth we) doeth make no alteration in sense at all. And here you may see howe Saint Paul teaching that we are iustified by fayth without workes before God: and Saint Iames teaching that we are iustified by woorkes, that is, doe declare our selues by our workes vnto men to be iustified, do agree.

Master Campion saide that he could yeelde and subscribe vnto that saying of Saint Thomas.

And we said, that we woulde doe the like, for that it is the very true doctrine that wee teache: howebeit he helde his penne from subscribing.

Then Master Sherwin alleaged these wordes of Saint Paul, If I had all faith, and haue not charitie, I am nothing. And he dyd very vehemently vrge the wordes, all faith, all faith, without charitie is nothing worth. 1.Cor.13.

Here saith one of the Pamphleters, silence was the answere: but howe truely, let him selfe see: for it was straight answered, Master Sherwin you may see, that the Apostle speaketh there of fayth in working of miracles, euen by the wordes of the Apostle himselfe, who saith, If I shoulde haue all faith, so that I could remoue mountaines, and haue not charitie, I am nothing. And when he cryed still *omnem fidem*, all faith, and that therefore it must conteine our faith also, els we had none at all.

It was answered by vs: If you will not beleeue vs, yet let Saint Chrisostomes exposition bee of some authoritie with you, who calleth it πίστιν δογμάτων ἀλλα σημείων, faith not of doctrine, but of miracles, saith Saint Chrisostome, euen as we also doe say: which fayth the wicked may haue as our Sauiour Christ teacheth, and therefore all faith to worke miracles, doeth not conteine that true Mat.7.22.23.

faith, which doeth iustifie him that hath it.

Further, they obiected Saint Pauls words in his Epistle to the
Galat.5. Galathians, Faith worketh by charitie.

We answered, that vnlesse faith doe worke by charitie, it is no faith at al: but that made nothing against our iustification by faith onely. But here they reasoned against vs, thus.

If faith onely iustifie, then it iustifieth without charitie: But that was contrary to the text of the Apostles: Therefore onely faith doeth not iustifie.

We answered, this Syllogisme consisteth of foure termes. For it is one thing to say that faith onely doeth iustifie, and another, that fayth is not without charitie. For when wee say that onely faith iustifieth, we meane not to denie that charitie is ioyned with that faith which iustifieth, being inseparably vnited vnto it: but that onely faith and not charitie is the meane, by which wee imbrace Iesus Christ our iustification and righteousnesse. And this wee indeuoured to make manifest by an example. The fyre (quoth wee) hath heate and lyght, which qualities can not bee seuered in that subiect, yet the fire burneth by heate onely, and not by light. Nowe, if any will reason thus: If the heate of the fire onely burne, then it burneth without the light of the fire: but that it can not doe: Therefore it burneth not by heate only. They shoulde shewe themselues to be absurd that so would reason, sayd we. And such is your reason against the iustification of faith onely, because it can not be separated from charitie. Likewise though the parts of mans body be ioyned together, and one is not without another in a perfect bodie, yet doeth the eye onely see, and the eare heare onely, and euery part hath his distinct office.

Then Master Sherwin alleadged out of the Epistle to the E-
Ephe.2. phesians: *Ipsius sumus factura, creati in Christo Iesu in bonis operibus.* That is, We are his workemanshippe, created in Christ Iesus in good workes.

We looked in the Greeke Testament, and found ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς *ad opera bona*, vnto good woorkes: and so answered, that Saint Paul sayth not, wee are the creatures of God in Christ thorowe good works, but that we are created of God in Christ to do good woorkes: which Master Sherwin (looking vpon the greeke Testament) could not denie. Further we tolde Master Sherwin, that

if he

if he tooke that place in that sense, that we were created in good workes, he was contrarie to Master Campion, who granted that good workes doe come, after the first grace, and not to bee ioyned with our first creation in Christ Iesus, as Master Sherwin would haue it. And besides that, we did admonish him, that the place by him alleaged, did of all others most effectually make against thē, and for vs. For immediately before the wordes by him alleadged, Saint Paul sayth thus: *Gratia enim estis saluati per fidem, & hoc non ex vobis, (Dei enim donum est) non ex operibus, ne quis glorietur.* That is, You are saued by grace through fayth, and that not of your selues, it is the gift of God, not of workes, least any man should boast himselfe. In this sentence of Saint Paul, euery parcell (quoth we) maketh for vs, and against you. The cause of our saluation is the grace of God, the instrument whereby we receiue it, is fayth, the false cause alleadged by you is here excluded, that is, our workes. Ephe. 2. 8, 9.

Master Campion alleadged, *Qui iustus est, iustificetur adhuc,* He that is righteous let him be more and more righteous. And thereupon he sayde, he would not refuse to subscribe, that we be iustified by fayth onely, so that we would subscribe, that being so iustified, we ought afterward to walke forward more and more in the workes of righteousnesse. Apoc. 22.

We granted that we would so subscribe.

But M. Sherwine said vnto M. Cāpion, Take heed what you do.

Then sayde Master Campion, If you will so subscribe and graunt withall, that those good workes are meritorious, or do merite, I will subscribe to faith onely.

Doe you nowe come in with your merite, (sayde we:) we will none of it, neither will acknowledge any merite (quoth we) in respect of our iustification, or of the kingdome of heauen, but only the merites of Christs passion. And so our subscribing was dasht by master Campions addition of merite to that, which before he promised without any mention thereof.

The pamphleters do say, that we refused to subscribe, not shewing M. Campions addition of merites.

But you doe knowe well (sayde master Campion) that often mention is made in the scripture of this worde *merces*, that is, of rewarde for our good workes. And that at the last iudgement it shall be sayde, Come into the kingdome ye blessed: For I was hungrie, and ye fed me, &c. So that these good workes are mentioned

tioned as a cause or a meane at the least, of entering into the kingdome of heauen.

We deny not (sayd we) but the worde *merces* is often mentioned in the holy Scriptures, and that God will rewarde our good workes, farre aboue our deseruing: but that *merces*, is *ex misericordia Domini dantis, & non ex merito hominis accipientis*. That reward is of the mercie of God giuing it, and not of the merite of man receiuing it. For when it is sayd, He that giueth a cuppe of colde water, shal not loose his reward: if you take that reward to be the kingdome of heauen, and the land of the liuing to be giuen for the merite thereof, surely you make it to be of more easie purchase, then any land in this worlde can be, be it neuer so little. And concerning the last iudgement, the wordes of our Sauiour, Come, possesse the kingdome prepared for you before the beginning of the worlde, may giue you to vnderstand, that it is not giuen for the merite of any their good workes, which they coulde not doe, before they were any thing. And the worde κληρονομήσατε Take ye the inheritance of the kingdome, sheweth that it is giuen to vs in Christ, as inheritance, which the Father giueth to his children freely, and is not purchased by our good workes. Besides that, though our Sauiour Christ will of his speciall grace and fauour, remember those almes done to the poore in his name, and take them as done vnto himselfe: yet were it an intollerable arrogancie for vs to say, We fed thee when thou wast hungry, &c. Or to say, Giue vs the reward of our cuppe of colde water, which thou promisedst we should not loose. Wherefore as we sayd, that *merces* and rewarde or hire, is of the grace and mercie of God giuing it, and not of the merite of man receiuing it, which is according to the true doctrine of the holy scriptures, that not flesh or man do glory or reioyce, but that he who doth glorie or reioyce in his iustification and saluation, may glorie and reioyce in the Lord onely: For Saint Paul sayth, Where is then thy reioycing? It is excluded. By what lawe? of workes? Nay, but by the lawe of fayth. Therefore we conclude, that a man is iustified by faith, without the workes of the lawe. And againe: If Abraham were iustified by workes, hee hath wherein to reioyce, but not with God. For to him that worketh, the wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt. But to him that worketh not, but beleeueth

Matth.10.

1 Corinth.1. 29,30,31. Ephes.2.8,9. Rom.3.27.

Rom.4.2.

ueth in him that iuſtifieth the vngodly, his fayth is counted for righteouſnes. And againe: Now if by grace, then not of works, for ſo grace is not nowe grace, &c. Thus farre Saint Paul. Whereby you may ſee, that if iuſtification and ſaluation ſhoulde be attributed to the merites of mans good woꝛkes, it would occaſion boaſting and gloꝛying in the fleſhe, and chalenging of our iuſtification and ſaluation as due vnto the merite of our woꝛks, & ſo much abate & abaſe the gloꝛie of Gods grace, that grace ſhould then no moꝛe deſerue the name of grace. But if iuſtification and ſaluation, be as it ought to bee, giuen wholy vnto Gods grace and mercie, pꝛomiſed vnto vs in Chꝛiſt Jeſu, which we doe appꝛehend and lay hold of by fayth onely, as the onely inſtrumentall cauſe vnder Gods grace: then is all the gloꝛie and honour of our iuſtification giuen vnto God onely, without any merite of man. And ſo we conclude as we ſayd beforꝛe, that we meane not by faith onely, to exclude the doing, but the meriting of good woꝛkes.

One of them alleadged the woꝛdes of our Sauiour, He that beleeueth and is baptized, ſhalbe ſaued. And hereupon he ſayde, We graunt that no merite doth pꝛeceede this fayth. Marke, 16.

Whereunto one of vs ſayd, when he was baptized, and obtayned that firſt grace and iuſtification which Maſter Campion ſpeaketh of, he may ſafely graunt, that no good woꝛkes doe pꝛeceede oꝛ go beforꝛe that iuſtification which he had in his infancie, the which no woꝛke at all doe oꝛ can pꝛeceede: but foꝛ his parte (ſayde he) when he doeth conſider, howe after that firſt grace, hee hath moſt vngratiouſly bꝛoken the bowe made to God in Baptiſme, and how fewe and ſmall good woꝛkes he had done towards the attepning of any ſecond iuſtification which Maſter Campion ſpeaketh of: howe many and great euill woꝛkes hee had done: how much of his life, his time and goods hee had miſpent: howe little he had ſpent in the ſeruice and to the honour of God: howe late he came to the Lꝛdes vineyarde, and howe loytering a labourer he had bene in that ſhoꝛt time: Surely (quoth hee) foꝛ my part, when I doe looke vpon my righteous woꝛkes ſo fewe and ſo imperfect, and on the other ſide vpon my vnrighteous deedes ſo many and ſo ſinnefull, I cannot but thinke it to bee a moſt damnable arrogancie, to chalenge any part of that ſecond righteouſneſſe, oꝛ of the kingdome of heauen, by ſo fewe and

small good workes: and do see how great occasion I should giue thereby, that God should condemne me for my so many and great euill workes, in respect of which I cannot but dispaire of any desert or merite towardes that seconde iustification that you doe speake of. Here Master Campion, to shewe belike that he was no Pharisee: I must confesse also (sayd he) that I haue bene most defectiue in all good workes, and in deede a loytering labourer (as you terme it) in the Lords vineyarde.

What remedie then quoth the other?

The remedie (quoth Master Campion) is, the mercie of God in Christ Iesus.

That is (quoth the other) that I beleeue, and this my belieke onely in his mercies thorowe Christ, and not in any late and loytering worke, is that faith, that shall saue me and you too, I trust: and therefore (quoth he) here (as in some good hope of our agreement, in this poynt of iustification by faith onely, without any merite of workes, which we trust we haue by the holy Scriptures, and by the ancient Doctors both Greekes and Latines, by examples, yea and by our consciences sufficiently proued) if it shall so please Master Lieutenant, let vs make an ende: and so we ended our conference.

A briefe recitall of certaine vntruthes ſcattered in the Pamphlets, and libels of the *Papiſts, concerning the former conferences:* with a ſhort anſwere vnto the ſame.

WE thought it not amiſſe, here in the ende, to note ſome of the principall poynts vntruely ſet downe by the authors of ſuch Pamphlets, as haue hitherto come to our handes concerning this conference. Firſt, they leaue no circumſtances of Maſter Campions impriſonment, his racking, ſicknes, lacke of his note bookes, of his libra-rie, our ſodaine cõming vpon him &c. vntouched. But they that will conſider his bragging chalenge made in his booke, and prompt readines to diſpute with all proteſtants: howe lately his booke was before by him ſet out, and howe freſh in his memorie, and howe we dealt with him onely in his owne booke, and in a fewe pointes in the verie beginning thereof: and did bring with vs all thoſe bookes which he himſelfe had noted and alleaged, and gaue them into his handes: and our ſelues alſo hauing made ready the places in the ſaid bookes by him noted to eaſe his trauell in ſeeking of them: who will (I ſaye) conſider theſe things, may hereby eaſily vnderſtand, their allegations of ſodaine taking of him, and his lacke of bookes, to be moſt vaine. And hee himſelfe by his lowde ſpeaches, and bolde and buſie geſtures, ſhewed no token of any either ſickneſſe or weakneſſe: neither did him ſelfe then complaine vpon thoſe difficulties, which the Pamphleters haue ſo diligently & largely noted ſithẽ.

They do charge ſome of vs, and ſpecially one, with **vncourteous wordes, and vncomely for profeſſors of the Goſpell** (as they ſaye) **ſpoken to Maſter Campion and others.** But they ſhewe not vpon what occaſion by Maſter Campion and others of his companions offred, theſe wordes were ſpoken. For when Maſter Campion did riſe vp from the forme whereon he ſate: did caſt vp and fling with his handes and armes: did knocke and beate vpon his booke at euery other worde, with an exceeding lowde voyce and ſharpe countenance, affirming that all our printed bookes were falſe, and that he would procure true copies to be ſent from the Emperours Maieſtie, & from the Duke

of Bauaria, and from an other prince (whom we remember not) vnto the Queenes Maiestie: was it I praye you so outragious in the latine tongue, as seuerally to admonish Maister Campion him selfe, without the vnderstanding of the common auditorie, for one of vs to saie, *Qui hic mos est mi homo? Quis hic gestus? Et loqueris & pultas fores? Glorioſus miles. Proijcis ampullas, et ſeſquipedalia verba?* We may bee bolde to saye, that considering Maister Campions bragging in English, and the admonition of the other in Latine, there was no such outrage as they doe note. But this they much disdaine, that he saide once, *Os impudens.* Trueth it is, but vpon his often and fierce affirmation that al the printed bookes of Luther in England were false: and vpon Poundes odious interpellations (as, wee knowe you to be a good Terence man) and his most scornefull lookes through his fingers, staring vpon him cõtinually whiles he was reasoning with Master Campion, to put him out of his memorie: hee being offended both with Poundes mockings, wordes and lookes, and with Campions shameles sayings, brake out with *Os impudens*, as he thinketh, most deseruedly on their partes.

Yea, but he vsed the word *obgannire*, or *oggannire*. Hee denieth not, but comming by commandement to conferre with Campion onely, when two or three of them spake together, and many other of them muttered, and sometime brake out into scornefull laughter, he said, *Siccine tam multos oggannire & obſtrepere?* This is the rage and railing wherewith the Pamphleters do charge him.

They say that he by a Commissioners checke, put the priests that would haue spoken, and Master Sherwin to silence. The trueth is, that though we were sent onely to Master Campion at that time, yet others did speake sometime, and Master Sherwin specially very much, and almost as much as did Master Cãpion. Whereupon not we, but Master Lieutenant told him, that he should be dealt with an other time, and willed him then to quiet him selfe. Hereupon it is, that the Pamphleters saie, wee should haue vsed them as the Queenes prisoners. Wee say, they should haue remembred, and behaued them selues as becommed prisoners, and not as Ruffians in all libertie or licentiousnes rather, as they in deede, and specially Master Campion

in the

in the forenoone behaued himself. And yet the Pamphleters are not ashamed to write, The Catholikes vsed no such wordes as did the Protestants, (and one of them specially) but being passing modest, went directly and soberly to the cause. And agayne: God gaue Master Campion (speaking very mildely as hee euer vsed) such modestie in answering. Thus write they, &c. Then surely his speaking did much differ from his writing, as is to bee seene by that his chalenge and booke, the most bragging and vaine glorious, that euer was written. Nowe Sherwin hath his contrarie commendation, of whome they write thus. But Master Sherwin like him selfe, with excellent courage spake. Master Sherwin here notably tooke the aduantage. Crosse blowes were continually giuen to the Protestantes, by Master Campion and Master Sherwin. Master Campion and Master Sherwin framed their reasons exceedingly well, with many such like commendations. But of vs they write, The Protestantes shusled vp the matter. They answered to an argument of the Catholikes, there be foure termes in this syllogisme, and no further answere. Silence here was their answere. M. Daye hauing belike of olde collection an other place in store, spent much time in that impertinent question. The Deane of Paules when he could do naught els, grinded with his teeth for despite & rage. And so the Catholikes by the iudgement of those that were not wholly wedded to will, did get the goale. *Scilicet.*

But the Pamphleters labour about nothing more, then to deliuer Master Campion from the note and blemish of ignorance in the Greeke tongue: whereof one of them writeth thus: The Deane of Paules and Master Beale shewed great ostentation towardes Campion, in offring him a Greeke Testament to reade a text of Paul. To whome Master Beale said, *Græcum est non potest legi*, calling vpon him to reade if hee could, &c, to the others vtter defacing, if he could haue procured it. But our good Lord gaue the other such modestie in answering him, as al indifferent persons were edified by it. And refusing there to reade (wherby Beale and the rest, were flatly then perswaded it was for lacke of skill) in the ende it fell out that Saint Basill was offered him in Greeke, and the booke holden him by a minister, wherein he read skilfully, and in the hearing of all the auditorie, confessed

the

the text to be as they alleaged it, answering it as before. And withall (quoth he) let this man witnesse, whether I can reade Greeke or no: who in open hearing answered, Very well. Whereupon being confounded, We confesse (quoth the Deane of Paules) you can reade Greeke, whereat some might haue blushed, if they had had any such good humour in them. Thus writeth one of them.

Another of them reporteth the matter thus. It happened in processe of their disputatiõs, by occasion incident, there was talke of a text of Scripture (which forsooth must be viewed by Master Campion) & to make the matter most plausible (as the Protestãts imagined) they caused a Greeke testamẽt to be brought vnto him, which he refused to take, saying merily to his contrarie, it shalbe yours. At which doing many laughed, condemning him for ignorance of the tongue, and therefore gestingly by the Protestants it was said, *Græcum est non potest legi.* It is Greeke, perhaps it can not be read. Whereunto Master Campion gaue no answere but rested at the matter, as a man vnable to reade Greeke, or to vnderstand the same. But it chaunced not long after, that the Protestantes as they had prepared before, were to alleage a place out of Saint Basil the Greeke doctor: and againe thinking to giue the Catholikes another bob, they commanded againe the booke of that ancient father to be giuen to Master Campion that he might reade, whome before they derided as not able to doe the same. But he tooke the booke, and hauing one of their ministers at his elbowe, both read and gaue the sense of the writer, and bad him beare witnes that hee was able to reade and vnderstande Greeke: whereat there was some admiration made among the Protestantes. And he was demanded why hee did not so before: who mildely answered, that the print was ouer small. Why saide they, had you not declared so much before? that had bene sufficiẽt. The like triall they made of an other Catholike, to wit Maister Sherwin, who by report of his fellowes and companions, is very well seene in the Greeke and Hebrewe tongues: yet he tooke the booke and viewed it, but openly did not reade, which was imagined that he did, to be accounted ignorant in the tongue, or rather for that he was willed to hold his peace, for that there should bee other times to talke. Thus they write of this matter, farre more largely and earnestly, then of any other. But the truthe is, that

when

when we had read the ſentences out of the Greeke Teſtament and Doctors once or twiſe our ſelues, wee offered the Greeke Teſtament firſt, and afterwardes Nazianzene in Greeke to Campion to reade, that he might credit his owne eyes, and that we alleaged their wordes truely. But he refuſed to reade in the Greeke teſtament altogether, as them ſelues do here confeſſe. And when Saint Baſill and Nazianzen in Greeke were offered to him to reade, he ſaid once or twiſe, **I knowe, I knowe, it is as ye haue alleaged:** which we tooke to be a ſhift, to auoyde the reading of it him ſelfe. But when he was vrged, & Maſter Stollard who ſtood by, tooke the booke and held it to him, he read, but ſo ſoftly as it were to him ſelfe, that wee may with good conſcience proteſt before God, that we heard not one word: ſo farre off was it that he read ſkilfully, & in the hearing of all the auditorie, as they doe write. But ſurely, whoſoeuer did knowe Campions vayne, may thinke that hee would haue read in the hearing of al the auditorie in deede, had he had any knowledge in that tongue: and not ſo haue whiſpered to him ſelfe, or in Maſter Stollardes eare. Truthe it is, that he ſaide, **Let this man witnes whether I can reade Greeke or no.** But why did hee not reade ſo, that not he alone, but that all we might haue bene witneſſes thereof?

Both Baſill & Nazianzen were offred, but it was Nazianzen & not Baſill, as they report.

But ſaye they, Maſter Stollard ſaid, hee read very well. They onely heard him ſo ſaye belike: for of truth he ſaid to vs, **If he did reade at al, he read the woꝛſt that euer I heard.** Which ſome of vs thought that Maſter Stollard ſpake, for that wee hauing read thoſe fewe wordes of Nazianzen, Δικαιοσύνη μὲν γὰρ καὶ πίστευσαι μόνον once or twiſe before the booke was giuen Campion, he might ſeeme out of his memorie to haue repeated them, rather then to haue read them out of the booke. Nowe, that we ſhould be in any admiration hereat as they write, what cauſe was there? For that we ſhould aſke him why he did not ſo much before, who heard him then not reade one word: or that the Deane of Pauls confounded ſhould ſay, **We confeſſe you can reade Greeke:** or that there was any cauſe giuen why we ſhould bluſh or be confounded, are moſt impudent lies, and moſt meete for ſuch reporters. Nay, rather may all Papiſtes bluſh for Campions ſake, who making ſuch a chalenge, as though he had had all knowledge,

in all learning and languages, when it came to the triall, vpon conscience of his ignorance, durst not reade openly one short sentence in Saint Basill or Nazianzen, the bookes being of a large and faire print. Surely, wee before our comming thither, vpon Campions owne bragging challenge and booke, and other mens reportes of him, thought wee should haue bene sore incumbred by his learning, and ouermatched by his knowledge in the tongues: so farre off was it, that wee meant to make any ostentation therein towardes him (as they write:) but vpon experience and triall with him, we found him not to be that man that we looked for, and went away with that opinion, that the booke which was so sodainly after his bragging chalenge, put in print, was none of his writing, much lesse penned by him as he was in his iourney, as hee reported himselfe: but, that it was elaborate before, by the common and long studie of all the best learned Iesuites, to serue at all oportunities. To the same effect is the report of Sherwin, who looking vpon the Greeke Testament, and reading neuer a worde, goeth yet away thereby, not onely with the commendation of a man verie well seene in the Greeke and Hebrew tongues: but also of singular modestie and contempt of all praises, as seeking to be accounted ignorant in that, wherein he had great skill. For that they would haue the cause of his not reading to be, for that he was willed to hold his peace, is very ridiculous: for he did oft speake, after he was so willed to holde him selfe contented: and then he was specially desired to reade, and not to holde his peace. But we thought the trueth to be, that when Sherwin had alleaged out of the second to the Ephesians after the olde translation, *Creati in bonis operibus*, we were created in good workes: and the originall Greeke being shewed vnto him, when he found it to be ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς *ad bona opera*, created to do good workes: he looked in the beginning and in the ende of the Greeke Testament, trusting as wee thought, that if he might haue found, that it had bene printed in any place, where the Gospel is preached, hee might after Campions exãple, haue made a challenge to the print as false, (which is now become a speciall shift of the Papists, and the last refuge when al other do faile:) but whẽ he did see that it was Plantines print, hee held his peace. Notwithstanding we do not thinke,

but

but that Sherwin could reade Greeke, the ignorance wherof we neither obiected to any, nor did make any oſtentation (as they write) of any our knowledge therein. Only we offered the bookes them ſelues vnto Campion, that his owne eyes might bee witneſſes, that the auncient fathers both Greekes and Latines did teache iuſtification by faith alone, euen as we do. By which occaſion, God as wee thinke by the opening of his ignorance, meant to controll his vaine glorious bragging of all knowledge and habilitie to deale with al men. Thus much, and too much of this matter, were it not that the reader may hereby vnderſtand, what vantages theſe writers and reporters doe take vnto them ſelues: yea and by ſpeedy and continuall ſpreading and beating of the ſame into the eares and heads of many, do much preuaile alſo, vntill time, the mother of trueth, ſhall diſcouer their vntruethes.

But we may by no meanes diſſemble another matter, by theſe Pamphleters ſore laide to our charge. Saint Auguſtine in the fourteenth chapter of his booke *De fide & operibus*, was by ſome of them in our conference (as we thinke) alleaged, as againſt our doctrine of iuſtification by faith alone: but in that confuſion of many ſpeaking at once, it was not greatly by any of vs marked or ſaid vnto, that we remember. But the authors of the Pamphlets do report this place of Saint Auguſtine, as by them of al other moſt effectually alleaged againſt vs. Their words be theſe. Unto this was added by the Catholikes the authoritie of Saint Auguſtine out of his booke *De fide & operibus* and the fourteenth chapter, where he hath regiſtred that this doctrine of Iuſtification by faith onely, was an hereſie taught in the Apoſtles time: for reformation whereof he declareth that S. Iohn, Saint Peter, S. Iude, and Saint Iames, did write their Epiſtles, wherein they ſo much inculcate the doctrine of good workes. *Auguſt. De fide & operib. ca. 14*

Thus they write, thus they whiſper in euery eare open vnto them, to the ſlander of vs and our doctrine of iuſtification by faith onely, as not onely an errour, but an hereſy alſo. But wee doe pray all indifferent readers, to conſider of theſe maner of dealings. For Saint Auguſtine in that place writeth againſt the wicked opinio of thoſe, who miſtaking Saint Paules wordes of Iuſtification by fayth without workes, do by an euill ſecuritie neglect to liue well, not

seeking by true faith the helpe of God, to the ouercomming of their owne euill concupiscences, but doe despise the workes of righteousnes, & by a dead faith do promise to them selues euerlasting life. These be Saint Augustines expresse wordes in that place truely translated, which they haue most vntruely and malitiously alleaged against vs, & against the heresie (as they terme it) of iustification by faith onely: which they woulde haue the simple people to mistake, as though wee woulde exclude all things vniuersally sauing faith onely: and did vtterly cast away all care of good workes, & godly life, yea, and all desire of Gods grace to assiste vs, as did they against whom S. Augustine in that place did write. But we protest before God and all good men, that we neuer meant to make faith the chiefe and onely cause of our iustification, but that the grace and mercie of God by our sauiour Iesus Christ promised to the faithfull in his holy worde, is the principall and originall cause, and very fountaine of our iustification: and that faith, not a dead faith (as they thought against whome S. Augustine doth write) but a liuely faith (being wrought in our hearts by the said word of God, and by the operation of the holy ghost) beleeuing Gods promise of his mercy in Christ, is the instrumentall cause in vs, whereby onely wee receiue our iustification, without the merite of our workes: and yet being iustified, we are most bound̄ to walke in all good works, as much as it shall please God to giue vs grace thereunto, for the which we ought to sue by cōtinuall & most heartie prayer. Which our doctrine, you may see to bee most contrarie to the wicked opinion of those, against whom S. Augustine writeth in that place, and that therefore it is most falsely and malitiously alleaged as against vs, who by faith onely iustifying vs, meane not to exclude the doing, but the merites of our good workes, which is no heresie, wherewith these men would charge vs, but the very truthe it selfe taught in the holy Scriptures, and by the auncient godly fathers and learned doctors set down in the very same wordes which we do vse, as hath bene before at large declared.

Of the conclusion of our conference the Pamphleters write thus. **At the last, the Protestantes did make adoe, as though some thing had bene wonne, when in my soule I protest there was not,**

but

but in any indifferent audience, the aduerſe Proteſtants had bene quite confounded. For Maſter Campion and Sherwin too, would haue ſayde much more in defence of their cauſe, but one of them by his Commiſſioners authoritie ſuddenly made an ende, cutting them off from all further ſpeach. Thus they do write. In deede when we had continued very long, and the ſunne ſhining vpon our faces in at the South windowes, and the throng being very greate, and by occaſion of both, the heate ſo intollerable, that ſome of vs were faine to go out of the chancell to take breath, and to returne againe : and Maſter Campion and wee being nowe come to a very neare poynt of agreement in the queſtion of iuſtification, (as is afore noted in the ende of our conference) wee turning to Maſter Lieutenant, ſayde, If it ſhall ſo pleaſe you, let vs here make an ende. With a good will ſayd he : and ſo we brake off. And here is all the Commiſſioners authoritie, which they ſpeake of, that wee or any of vs did take vpon vs. And thus ended our conference with Campion : the iudgement of the trueth of their or our reportes whereof, wee doe leaue vnto God, and to thoſe who were preſent thereat. Surely we by our notes ſet downe, whiles our cõference was yet freſh in memorie, and by ſundrie conferences amongſt our ſelues ſithen, and with other alſo, who were there preſent, yea and by diligent peruſing of the pamphlets written againſt vs, haue endeuoured to ſet downe all poyntes that were dealt with in our ſayd conference, with as much trueth concerning the ſubſtance of the matter, as our diligence and memory, and the remembrance of other alſo, could poſſibly attaine vnto.

A. Nowell. *W. Daiie.*

HONI SOIT QVI MAL Y PENSE
DIEV ET MON DROIT

¶ The three last dayes conferences had in the Tower with *Edmund Campion Fesuite, the* 18: 23: and 27. of September. 1581. collected *and faithfully set downe by M.* Iohn Feilde student in *Diuinitie.*

Nowe perused by the learned men *themselues, and thought meete* to be published.

Ianuarij. 1. 1583.

To the Christian Reader, grace and peace,

THou hast here, gentle Reuder, a true report of the whole substance of the conferences had in the Tower the last three dayes, faythfully gathered out of the notes of diuers that wrote there, and afterwarde perused by the learned men them selues, and nowe lastly published by authoritie. If any man be inquisitiue why they were set forth no sooner, he may vnderstande, that being priuate conferences, it was thought not much requisite to make thē publikely knowen, neither had they bin now set forth, if the importunitie of the aduersaries, by their sundry vntrue and contrary reportes made and scattered amongst their fauourites, had not euen perforce drawen thē forth. If Campions answeres be thought shorter thē they were, thou must knowe that he had much wast speach, which being impertinent, is nowe omitted: although I protest, nothing is cut off from the weight and substance of the matter: for of that, I made conscience, and had speciall regarde. Againe, if the repliers speaches seeme to be more ample: it is, because their authorities then alleadged onely in Greeke or Latine, are nowe at large put downe, both in Greeke, Latine, and English. But for the arguments and answeres, I was euen religious faythfully to reporte them, as they were.

Wherein, I appeale to all the hearers in Gods sight, to whose grace I commit thee.

Iohn Feilde.

A remembrance

of the conference, had in the Tower with Edmunde Campion Iesuite, by *William Fulke, and Roger Goade* Doctours in Diuinitie, the 18. *of September*, 1581. as followeth.

After that Master D. Fulke had made a godly prayer for direction in that action, that it woulde please God to confirme the faithfull, and to confounde the obstinate and wilfull, & that Campion denying to pray with them, had superstitiously all to becrossed him selfe, Master D. Fulke beganne with this preface in effect.

D. Fulke. Where as there hath bene some proceeding with you before, and we are come by order to the thirde chapter of your booke, where you slaunder our Church of Englande & the whole Church of God, for the definition of the Catholike Church, for that we define it so, as it shoulde be inuisible: we come to proue both by the Scriptures and Fathers, that it is inuisible. But this I woulde haue knowen vnto you, that our purpose is not to deale by discourse, but briefely by Logical arguments, according to the order of schooles, &c.

After he had inquired D. Fulkes name, Campion also spake after this maner.

Campion. The disputation that I desire, is yet behinde: for I desire it might bee in the Vniuersities. This may bee called a conference, but it is not the disputation which I require. Besides, these conferences are vnequall, both in respect of the suddainnesse of

of them, as also for want of such necessary helpes as were fitte and conuenient. I see that you haue some appointed to note, as if it were made a solemne matter. I shoulde haue the like, so shoulde I haue come better furnished, and all these might haue bene better profited. Besides, I haue bene yll dealt withall already, & things heretofore spoken by me, haue bene mistaken, and published in print otherwise then I euer meant.

D. Fulke. For the suddennesse, it is all alike with vs. Master Lieutenant sent you worde by my request, to chuse the question your selfe on Saturday last at noone: so that you had knowledge of the question as soone as we, and also the choyse and appointing thereof. As for the noting, it is not made so solemne a matter that it can preiudice you, but to preuent false reportes that may bee spread of the conference, iniurious as well to you as to vs. As for the disputation you require, it is not at our appointment: It must be ordred by them that are to appoint both you and vs. We come by commandement, &c. but let vs goe to the matter. You slaunder vs, and Master Caluine likewise, in the thirde chapter of your booke, for defining of the Catholike Church as we do. You say we make it a Platonicall Idæa, an ayrie thing, that is no where &c. But I will proue that it is against the nature of the Catholike Church, at any time to be visible.

Here was speache, that nothing was meant by the noting, but a priuate matter, & to preuent false reports.

Campion. Where do I slaunder you or Caluine? Reade my booke, I wil maintaine my booke and euery part of it. And as for the Catholike Church, I will maintaine, that from the time of Adam to Christ, and from Christ vnto vs, the Church hath bene visible. But because you say I slaunder you and Caluine, shewe my wordes.

D. Fulke. These are your wordes. *Non est ausus contrauenire sontu, videri noluit Ecclesiæ quam toties Scriptura commemorant, refragari, nomen callidè retinuit, rem ipsam funditùs definiendo sustulit &c.* And ye quote Cal. Institut. lib. 4. cap. 1. Sect. 2. & 3. Here you plainely slaunder Caluine and vs, for defining the Catholike Church (comprehending all the elect of God that haue bene, are, or shalbe) to be inuisible.

Camp. The Catholike Church is considered according to her parts, triumphant in heauen, and militant on earth: generally, & particularly: and I am ready to maintaine, that alwayes the

militant

militant Church in earth is visible: euery preacher in his prayer knoweth this, who in their prayers pray for the Church militant: therefore this is the point, whether this be alwayes visible?

Fulke. Well then it appeareth in the very beginning, that you swarue from the title of your owne booke, slaundering vs without cause, for the definition of the whole Catholike Church, and Sophistically you goe from the whole to a parte, from the Catholike Church to the Church militant, which is but a part of it, when as the whole Catholike Church comprehendeth all the elect, and is the full body of Christ, that filleth all in all things, as the Apostle sayeth, and as we confesse in the articles of our faith, We beleeue the Catholike church. We deny not that the church militant sometime is visible: but we affirme that the whole Catholike Church, whereof our definition is giuen, is not visible. And what cause haue you then to exclaime vpon Caluine and vs, for defining the Catholike Church to be inuisible? This we are here ready to proove.

Camp. I haue sayde, that vpon earth the Church is alwayes visible. But I pray you let vs speake of the Church militant. I am sure these gentlemē would heare, not of a Church of Saints in heauen, but of a Church in earth, whereto they may ioyne themselues, what should we talke of the Church in heauen? They would rather knowe I am sure, of what Church they are here: Aske them. And this hee spake with great iolitie & scoffingly.

Fulke. Well then you are found recreant in this point, openly to slaunder our definition to be such as should take away the nature of the Church, in that we make it inuisible, and now when it commeth to the tryall, you will not deale with the Catholike Church, whereof our definition is giuen: but with a part of it, to witte, that which is vpon earth, which we neuer denied in some sense to be alwayes visible, because it consisteth of men vpō earth, although it be not alwayes seene, because it is oftentimes hidden from the worlde, and sometimes also from the true members thereof. But this Church vpon earth you will haue to be alwaies visible. Seeing therefore you giue ouer ẏ defence of your slaūder of our definition of the Catholike Church, which we came prepared to maintaine: we are ready also to reason of ẏ church militāt.

Campion. The state of the question is, that the Church mili-

tant vpon earth, can not be hidden, but it is alwayes knowen, so that a man may vnderstand of what Church he is, &c.

Fulke. The case may be such as a member can know no more but himselfe: what meane you by visible?

Campion. I meane to be visible, is to knowe one another, to meete at Sacraments, when I can tell that I am of this church, and you of that, I a Catholike, and you a Protestant, as I certainely know there is a Church in Fraunce, a church in Spaine, and in Flaunders, though I be farre from it, and we may know one another: a member can say, This is my pastor, these are my prelates and gouernours. This is plaine. I would to God I had one alse to write for me. I pray you let me not be mistaken, for I haue had great wrong that wayes, and things haue bene put in print, that I neuer spake or meant.

Here was much a do about writing, & yet I neuer knewe any thing imprinted that might preiudice him.

Fulke. If we haue this discoursing, we shal neuer haue done: I would you would be briefe. I will proove from a place of scripture, that the church militant (vnderstanding visible as you say) is not alwayes visible in earth. Elias complaineth, that he was left alone &c. Ergo the Church was not then visible.

1. Argument.

Campion. I deny the Antecedent, & further declare the meaning of the place, which maketh altogether for me. For Elias setteth out the schismatical church of the Samaritanes. In this schismaticall church, a member being driuen out, (as sometime it falleth out to bee) the worlde turning and changing, he might not know the rest: but yet knew there were 7000. that neuer bowed their knees to Baal. Againe, you must not bring a particular to ouerthrowe a generall. There were none there: therefore there were none in other places. But this place is an excellent place against you. For as the Prophet complained there, so we may iustly complaine now, O Lord they haue forsaken thy couenãt, they haue destroyed thine altars, and slaine thy Prophetes with the sword, and I am left alone &c. Yet no doubt, there were many: as for example, I might haue complained of Geneua, when I was there, that I had bene alone, not knowing of any other Catholike there. Were all the Protestants in England in Queene Maries time gone? were there none? and are all Catholikes nowe gone? Whatsoeuer they bee, I knowe certainely there is a Church in Fraunce &c. And so then there was a flourishing church in Iudea,

vnder

vnder Asa, and Iehosaphat, whither Elias was flying for succour and relefe, &c.

Fulke. I thought we should haue discoursing. You declare your selfe vtterly ignorant in all this matter. For where were these wordes spoken?

Cãp. They were spokẽ as he was flying into Iudea, to ỹ church whither he knew to repaire, teaching vs what to do in ỹ like case.

Fulke. That is not true, they were spoken in mount Horeb, as he was in the wildernesse, after he was fled from the persecution of Iezebel, when she had determined his death.

Campion. The text is playne, *Venitque Beersebæ Iudeæ &c.* He came to Beersheba of Iudea &c.

Fulke. His flight was into the wildernes, & Beersheba was in his way, where he left his seruant, & so went forward into the wildernes. For Beersheba was the vtmost towne in Iudea towards Horeb, & both Beersheba & the wildernes of Arabia, were from Iudea towards Horeb. And therefore the text sayth, *Ipse verò perexit*, He went forward, &c. continuing his iourney to the wildernesse, and therefore it is not true you sayd, he went into Iudea, to ioyne himselfe with the Church, or to seeke relefe there.

Campion. But his complaint was of a particular place, for the Church flourished in Iudea vnder two notable kings, Asa and Iehosaphat. And when he sayeth, *Ego solus*, he meaneth that hee was the onely Prophet that was left &c.

Fulke. This answere cannot stand with the oracle, which pronounceth that God had left 7000. true worshippers. Wherefore it is manifest, that Elias thought himselfe the onely true worshipper that was left in Israel, except you will say there were 7000. prophets, whereof he was ignorant. But ye answere ỹ the Church was then so visible, ỹ he knew whither to resort. But I will proue ỹ the church of Iudea, (vnto which ỹ cõgregation of Israel, if they be a true church must be ioined) was so inuisible at some time, that it had not so much as ỹ face of a Church, whither any mã in Elias case might resort. It is written 2. king. 16. that vnder ỹ reigne of Achas, there was taken a paterne of the Altar of the idolaters of Damascus, & that Vrias the high Priest remoued the Altar of the Lord. Whereby it appeareth, that the priesthoode was corrupted, the Altar was remoued, and the sacrifices vtterly ceased, &c. Here the wordes of the text were read

Campion. That might well be. For there might be such a time, and the case might so fall out, that there could be no exercise of the priestly function, & yet it might remaine visible inough, &c.

Fulke. Very wel, what visibilitie could there be in those dayes of Achas, Manasses, and such like, when there was no face at all of an outward Church, neither in the head nor in the members, when the high Priest was become an idolater? Howe could they know whither to resort, the Temple being defiled, and the priesthoode it selfe so defiled with idolatrie? &c.

Campion. What meane you by the face of a Church? It might for all this be knowen, though they could not exercise their function.

Fulke. How could that be? when there was no outward forme of a Church, it fayled in the head, in the chiefe, & in the members. There was no place for their publike sacrifices, seeing that onely place, to which they were bound to resort, was defiled with heathenish idolatrie. For it must be there and no where else. And I doubt not but there were particular members, that were knowen to God, or might knowe one another: yet was there not a visible Church, as you determine of the worde visible, to be, when men know their pastors & prelates, and the place whither to resort, &c.

Campion. I say, the dayes were as these dayes are nowe to Catholikes, or as they were to you in ỹ dayes of Queene Marie, to them that are in prison: & yet we know there were protestants left, and those that were in prison knew wel inough to resort vnto them, that were abroade: and so of the Catholikes, though nowe Masse be forbidden, and the execution of their priesthood, yet Catholikes know Catholikes, and whither to resort for the exercise of Catholike religion.

Fulke. But in Iudæa they knewe not whither to resort, when the temple it selfe was defiled, where onely by the law of God the sacrifice was appointed to be offered. Therefore although there were a Church then, yet it could not be visible.

Camp. Reade the wordes: The kings of Iuda were as our kings, & as I said, before the times turned, there was many changes. But doth this follow: there is no Church in England where Masse is said (which I dare say many catholikes loue, & would go a great way to heare with all their hearts:) Ergo there are no Catholikes

Bolde asseuerations.

cholikes in England: They had no open Cõmunions in Queene Maries time: ergo there were none, &c?

Fulke. You make bolde cõparisons, you cloye vs with wordes and go from the matter. We say not that the Church could euer perish out of the earth for one moment of time, or that they were not, because they were not seene, but we say against your assertion, the Church in Iudæa was not visible, because there was neither place nor sacrifice, nor high Priest, &c. The Priest was wicked, the Temple was defiled, &c. Nowe all kingdomes may professe religion, & haue their exercises thereof in all places, though they could not doe so in Iudæa.

Campion. You haue made a good argument for mee, Maister Doctor. I wil knit it vp with this: though they might onely exercise in the Temple, yet we may euery where: and though Elias sawe them not, yet there were thousands: so though it be not permitted now to say Masse publikely, & to exercise our functions, yet there are thousands.

Fulke. Here is nothing but repetitions. All this is not denied, but where is the visibilitie of this Church vpon earth knowen to men, (as for God he alwayes knoweth them that are his) when the head Pastor, and the only place of exercise of Jewish religion was corrupt.

Campion. And yet there was Tobias in Israel, and other.

Tobias was of another time, for it was frõ the dayes of Achab vnto Salmanazar 140. yeeres at the least.

Fulke. That is not the matter: it was not visible, because they had no other place to exercise in but the Temple at Jerusalem, which at these times was polluted, the very Aultar of God being remoued, and an idolatrous altar set in the place.

Campion. That is not alike, for we haue our functions free, we may sacrifice euery where, and say Masse vpon euery mountaine.

Fulke. Like inough for that matter. But there was not so much as an outward face of the Church, the high Priest being an Idolater, and the true Altar taken away, and therefore there could be no visibilitie. You answere nothing to the matter, but abuse the presence with multitude of wordes, and therefore committing the iudgement to them that be wise and learned, I wil giue place vnto my brother.

Mast. D. Goade. Concerning the short warning, the case is all

one with vs, as it was with you, we had no longer deliberation then you had, litle aboue one dayes space, concerning the question, and therefore you haue no cause to complaine, &c.

Campion. What shall I call your worships name?

Goade. My name is Goade.

Campion. Yes that may appeare by this preparation, as it were to a set and solemne thing, these bookes also declare, besides the bringing of a writer with you, &c.

Goade. Wel, all these concerne not the matter, you had word assoone as we, & were so made acquainted with the question, as it was of your owne choyce, &c. but in deede you are gone from the state of the question, against which we came prepared, being of the whole Catholike Church, as your owne booke doth importe, and it is apparant that you haue wrongfully challenged our definition, being (as hath bene truely sayd) of the Church in generall: well we must I see now, follow whither you leade vs. We must leaue the Catholike Church, and talke of the militant Church, the generall, and goe to a particular. One thing before I ioyne with you I would wish you to forbeare, namely your dealing with the present state and personall speaches, it will better beseeme modestie, and pertaine more to the matter we haue in hand, &c. which may be performed with lesse waste of wordes and more humilitie. You answere not to the report I haue heard of you, for modest behauing your selfe in conference.

Campion. Concerning my selfe, I will lay my hands vnder your feete, but I must not humble God to you, you knowe who saith, *Ne sis humilis in sapientia tua*, be not humble in thy wisedome. I must with courage mainteine religion. *Hæc est sapientia vestra coram populo*, this is your wisedome before the people, &c. I must not be prayed in religion.

Goade. Howe fitly those places of Scripture are applied, I will not now stand to discusse: but concerning the state of the question as your selfe set it downe, you are fallen from it. And the Church euen as it is vpon earth, being but a part of the Catholike Church, I will proue sometime to be hidden. But what meane you when you write that it must be of the nature of the Church, to be visible?

Campion. I meane that it must be an essentiall marke of the

Church,

Church, & such a qualitie as is inseparable. It must be a visible, as fire is hote, water moist, &c.

Goade. Very good: but as you vnderstand this qualitie of visibilitie, you declare your selfe to dissente from others of your side, who by visible, vnderstand a notable glorious Church, who hath her beautie and pompe, and as your Bristowe writeth, her continuall succession of Bishops, &c. Campion agreeth not with others of his owne side.

Campion. That same outward pompe & glory, may be wanting, and yet the Church be visible inough. I woulde bee loth to medle with that question of succession. You know why I woulde not willingly deale in it.

Goade. Well, as hath bene proued out of the olde testament that there was a time when the Church militant was hidden, so will I proue it out of the newe. There was a time when our Saviour Christ being smitten, and all the rest of the Apostles scattered and hidden, that visibilitie was not an inseparable qualitie, ergo this qualitie is not alwayes inseparable. 2. Argument.

Campion. I denie the Antecedent.

Goade. I thinke any here might proue the Antecedent: the storie of that time sheweth it plaine. The face of ỳ visible Church was then not in Christ & his Apostles, but in ỳ Iewes amongst the Scribes and Pharisees: they had the succession of the Priesthoode and held the chaires. Christ was crucified, put to death and buried, the Apostles scattered and fled into holes and corners, so that if visibilitie be such a certaine marke of the true Church, then the high Priestes, Scribes and Pharises, were the true Church, and not our Saviour Christ and his Apostles.

Campion. It was a Church inchoate, beginning, not perfect.

Goade. Therefore it was at sometime hidden, &c. namely in the beginning of the Church: where was then this visibilitie?

Campion. In the virgin Marie, Zacharie, Iohn Baptiste, Peter, &c.

Goade. What shewe you me these to proue the Church visible? who was Pastor, when the Pastor was smitten and killed? who occupied the chaires? where was the outwarde face of the Church, which you will haue to be so glorious? and where was the Pastor and outward exercise of Religion?

Campion. I haue said before, that it is not necessarie, it should

haue

haue alwayes that outward pompe and glory. In the beginning, it is not apparant, as afterwards.

Goade. Ergo there is a time, when it may be hidden.

Campion. Not hidden, for they were gathered together. It was in deede *pusillus grex*, a litle flocke, but proue that it was not visible.

Goade. Because you make light accompt of these times, as being but the beginnings of the Church, let vs go on to the proceedings and encrease. In those great persecutions vnder the cruell Emperours, the Church became hidde and inuisible, ergo visibilitie is not an inseparable marke: specially in the time of Diocleſian, Christians were so wasted as to the iudgement of men, there were none remaining: their bookes were burnt, their Churches destroyed, and themselues put to death with sundrie torments.

Camp. You answere your selfe. For against whom was this persecution so hot, against whō fought they, were they shadowes? I am sure there were Christians, or els they could not haue stood foorth to haue endured those torments: but I coulde shewe you Rome in that time. Some escaped till Constantines time, much about three and twenty yeeres. All were not eaten vp: for then euery man would be a Christian, and well was he that could shew himself so. I could name you the Bishop of Rome that then was.

Pillars were erected in euery place with this blasphemous inscription, *superstitione Christi vbique deleta, &c.*

Goade. But in the ende after that great hauocke was made, and crueltie had wasted all that coulde be found, where was then the visible Church? In the ende it was enforced to be hidden. It had lost that which you say must needes be of the nature of it, the glory of it was so eclipsed that it shined no where.

Campion. It was most visible then and most glorious, and not long after, when Constantine came, all were Christians: Whereby it appeareth that diuers remained.

Goade. That is not to the point: though some remained, yet they were hidde. All being persecuted and put to death that could be knowen or found.

Campion. The time of these persecutions, was euen like to our times. For then the Christians were exiled, put to death, driuen into corners, as the Catholikes are nowe, and yet there remained inough, &c, and they were knowen.

Goade.

Goade. Surely you make euill and vntrue comparisons, you haue no such cause to complaine of bloody persecutions in ỹ time of our gratious Queene, and do not well to compare her highnes peaceable and milde gouernement with those tyrannicall persecutions: ye might better liken your crueltie shewed in Queene Maries time to those examples. I had thought to haue founde more modestie in you.

The Papistes call iustice for treason, persecution for religion.

Campion. Well, let the comparison be of Q. Maries time: then Protestants were put to death, & yet there remained many.

Goade. The question is not whether they remained, but whether they were seene. But you saide of those Emperours times, that there remained many, and they were not vnknowen. They were vnknowen both to the faithles and faithfull: ergo they were altogether vnknowen.

Campion. I deny both partes of the antecedent.

Goade. Then I must proue both distinctly, and first touching the faithles. The faithles coulde not know the Church: therefore they did not know it.

Camp. They knew it not by faith, but by sense they knew it.

Goade. Iohn 3. The worlde knoweth not vs, because it knoweth not him.

Campion. I tolde you they did not know him as they ought to know him, to saluation. They knewe, but not fruitfully and effectually. As I know you are a Protestant, but yet beleeue not your religion. And a man that saith Masse is knowen, & yet you doe not beleeue in it.

Goade. But though the persons were knowen, yet they knew them not to be of the Church. I wil come to the other part of the antecedent.

As is the whole so are the partes:

But God onely knoweth the whole:

Ergo he onely knoweth the partes. For the members of Christ are knowen to Christ alone. By reason of many hypocrites, men are not able to iudge who are truely faithfull. There are many wolues within, and many sheepe without: *Deus nouit qui sunt sui*, 2. Tim. 2. God knoweth who are his: therefore the true members of Christ can not be knowen but to God alone.

Campion. I knowe not who is elect, but I knowe who is a

Catholike: I knowe not whether the Bishop of Rome bee elect or no, &c.

Goade. Onely the elect are of the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

Camp. I say that both good & euil are of the visible Church.

Goade. Christ hath no dead members of his body: therefore the reprobate can not bee of the Church. I will helpe you with a distinction. They may bee in the Church, but not of the Church.

Campion. The distinction is Caluins, and therefore I refuse it. But you answere your selfe, for euil men may be *viua membra Christi*, the liuely members of Christ in respect of faith, but not in respect of charitie. A man may be a member of ỹ body of Christ, as it is here in earth, being a wicked man: but onely the godly are members of his body as it is in heauē. Your owne argument doth confound you. It is impossible to know the elect: therefore it is impossible the Church should be inuisible.

Strange Diuinitie.

Goade. It is your part to answere, not to oppose: you vse many words & graunt absurdities. Your argument doth not folow.

Campion. You cannot know any particular man to be elect, you cannot pronounce it of your selfe: therefore you cannot measure the Church by election: then it remaineth the Church must be visible, because it must be knowen.

Goade. To be elect or true members of Christ is one thing, and to be in the visible Church is another.

Campion. This was Wicklieses error that onely the electe were true members of the Church: but as I haue saide, no man can knowe who is elect, and therefore you teache that no man can knowe a member of the Church, nor no man can knowe that hee shall be saued.

Goade. Particular election is not so vnknowen as you would make it: for a man may haue knowledge of his owne election by vndoubted testimonies, and see the signes of election in others.

Fulke. You saide before that visibilitie was an inseparable qualitie of the Church, whereupon I reason thus.

The thirde argument.

If it be an inseparable qualitie, it is an inseparable note:
But it is not an inseparable note:
Ergo not an inseparable qualitie.

Camp.

Campion. I denie both the Maior and the Minor: both may be doubted of.

Fulke. I will proue both.

Campion. Giue me leaue: A note is more then a qualitie. The qualitie is to goe right, to goe the neereſt and gainelt way, the ſafeſt way. A note is a marke that may be remoued, that teacheth to turne on the right hand, or on the left, by this croſſe, or by that windmill or marke, &c.

Fulke. I graunt there is a difference betweene a note and a qualitie, and you needed not ſo many wordes to haue ſhewed that, but I ſpeake of an inſeparable note, and an inſeparable qualitie. That qualitie which is inſeparable, being alſo a note, muſt needes be an inſeparable note. Alſo of that your ſelfe haue ſayd, that it is an eſſentiall qualitie. I will proue the Maior.

Whatſoeuer marke is of the eſſence or nature, is inſeparable:

The viſiblenes is a marke which is of the eſſence and nature of the Church:

Therefore it is an inſeparable marke.

Campion. It is an inſeparable qualitie, but not an inſeparable note, but after a ſorte: for a qualitie muſt euermore ſtand, but a marke may be taken away.

Fulke. The queſtion is, whether it be an inſeparable note of the Church that cannot be taken away.

Campion. I ſay it may be, in a ſenſe.

Fulke. I know not what ſenſe you ſpeake of, but this is euident by your owne confeſſion, the viſiblenes of the Church is a marke, and it is of the nature. Ergo it is inſeparable, ſo my Maior is playne.

Campion. Proue your Minor.

Fulke. There was a time when viſiblenes was no note of the Church: ergo it is not an inſeparable note.

Campion. I denie the Antecedent.

Fulke. There was a time, when ỹ Church was only knowen by the Scriptures: therefore there was a time when viſiblenes was no note of the Church.

Campion. I denie both the Antecedent and the conſequent.

Fulke. I will proue both, and firſt the Antecedent.

Camp. Nay, proue the conſequent firſt, & then ỹ antecedent.

Fulke. Why, the other is first, both in order and nature.

Campion. Nay. Whensoeuer the consequent is denied, you must straight proue the argument.

Fulke. That is, if the consequent onely be denied, but seeing you denie both, I wil first proue that which in nature and order is first, and afterward I wil proue the other, (if it neede.) It is but a foxy shift of you, to decline from the point of the question. Chrysostome saith, that Christianitie which is the Church, is to bee knowen onely by the Scriptures. He hath these wordes, *Tantummodo per scripturas: nullo modo: nulla probatio, &c.*

Homil. in Matth. 24.

There is no other proofe, there is none other way to knowe the Church or true Christianitie, but only by the Scripture.

Wherefore thus I frame my argument out of Chrysostomes place.

The Church is to be knowen onely by the Scriptures:
But visibilitie is not the Scriptures:
Ergo the Church is not to be knowen by visibilitie. Or thus.
The only note to know the Church by, is ỹ holy Scriptures:
Visibilitie is not the holy Scriptures:
Ergo visibilitie is not a note to know the Church by.

Campion. Yea, out of the Scriptures the Church may be knowen, for the Scriptures appoint visiblenes to be a marke of the Church. But I denie the Minor.

Fulke. Doe you say then, that visibilitie is the Scripture?

Campion. I say, visibilitie is conteined in the Scriptures.

Fulke. My Minor is, that visiblenes is not the Scripture, and so vpon my Maior, which is Chrysostomes authoritie, I conclude that visiblenes is no marke of the Church.

Campion. I know Chrysostomes place, he denieth not visiblenes to be a note. You may go to another argument.

Fulke. You would not heare Chrysostome by your will, but he shalbe read by your leaue.

Tunc cum videritis abominationem desolationis stantem in loco sancto, id est, cum videritis hæresim impiam, quæ est exercitus Antichristi stantem in locis sanctis Ecclesiæ: in illo tempore qui in Iudea sunt, fugiant ad montes, id est, qui sunt in Christianitate, conferant se ad scripturas. Sicut enim verus Iudeus est Christianus dicente Apostolo, non qui in manifesto, sed qui in occulto: sic vera Iudea, Christianitas est, cuius nomen intelligitur confessio. Montes autem sunt scripturæ Apostolorum aut Prophetarum, de quibus dictum est,

Illuminas

Illuminas tu mirabiliter a montibus æternis. Et iterum de ecclesia dicit: fundamenta eius in montibus sanctis. Et quare iubet in hoc tempore omnes Christianos conferre se ad Scripturas? Quia in tempore hoc, ex quo obtinuit hæresis illas Ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse veræ Christianitatis, neque effugium potest esse Christianorum aliud volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi Scripturæ diuinæ. Antea enim multis modis ostendebatur, quæ esset Ecclesia Christi, & quæ gentilitas: nunc autem nullo modo cognoscitur volentibus cognoscere quæ sit vera Ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummodò per scripturas, &c. Then when you shall see the abomination of desolation standing in that holy place, that is, when you shall see an vngodly heresie, which is the armie of Antichrist, standing in the holy places of the Church: in that time, they which are in Iurie, let them flie to the mountaines, that is, they that are in Christianitie, let them get them to the Scriptures. For as the true Iewe is a Christian (as the Apostle sayeth) not which is in open sight, but which is in secrete: so true Iurie (whose name is vnderstood to be confession) is Christianitie. And the mountaines are the Scripture of the Apostles and Prophets: of whome it is sayde, Thou doest giue light marueilously from the euerlasting mountaines. And againe he sayeth of the Church, Her foundations are in the holy hilles. And wherefore doeth he commaunde all Christians in this time, to get them to the Scriptures? Because in this time, since heresie hath obtained those Churches, there can be no tryall of true Christianitie, neither can there be any other escape of Christians, which would knowe the trueth of the faith, but the Diuine Scriptures. For beforetimes, it was shewed by many wayes which was the Church of Christ, and which was gentilitie: but nowe to them that woulde knowe which is the true Church of Christ, it is knowen by none other meanes, but onely by the Scriptures. This is playne for the Antecedent. And these particles are playne, *Nullo modo cognoscitur*, It is knowen by no meanes, there is no other proofe, but *tantummodo per Scripturas*, onely by the Scriptures.

Campion. Maister Doctor you knowe the order, I denie the consequent, you proue the Antecedent.

Fulke. You denied the Antecedent, and therefore it was necessarie for me to proue it. But this place also doeth proue the Con-

sequence of mine argument, which you denyed. Let me see howe you can answere to the place.

All other markes in time of heresie or schisme, by Chrysostomes iudgement are excluded, but onely the Scriptures:

Therefore visibilitie also is excluded from being a marke of the Church.

Campion. When the Church was first planted, there was miracles, by which it might be knowen: but nowe they ceasing, it is to be knowen (sayeth Chrysostome) onely by the Scriptures: meaning that it is not to be knowen by miracles, &c.

Fulke. This answere is a senseles cauil, which is easily auoyded. For there is an Antithesis or opposition in Chrysostomes wordes: howe it was knowen before, that is, *multis modis* by many wayes, and howe it may be knowen nowe, by one onely way, *tantummodo per Scripturas*, onely by the Scriptures. For nowe that Antichrist is reuealed, he excludeth all wayes, except one, and sayeth it must be knowen onely by the Scriptures. Therefore he excludeth visiblenesse as well as miracles, from being an inseparable note of the Church.

Campion. It excludeth miracles, &c.

Fulke. Well then your answere is, that *nullo modo: nulla probatio: & tantummodo*: excludeth nothing but miracles.

Campion. Yea, and that appeareth by the wordes, *Ante tempus Antichristi*. For whereunto els should *nunc* and *ante* be referred, except it had meant by *ante*, before the primatiue Church, and *nunc* nowe by the present and instant time.

Fulke. You doe but talke: you can not so put away, *Nulla probatio*, No proofe. *Nullo modo*, by no meane it is knowen, but *tantummodo per Scripturas*, onely by the Scriptures, &c. He speaketh of all times since heresies haue occupied the Churches. If you will answere no otherwise, I will rest vpon iudgement.

Campion. I haue answered, but I would to God I had a notarie: well, I commit all to God. But I pray you note that I say, that visibilitie is included in the Scriptures.

Goade. I will examine this cause by a manifest place, one of the strongest that is alleaged by those of your side, to prooue the visibilitie of the Church: namely, that out of the 5. of Matthewe, A citie that is buylded on a hill, can not be hid, whereupon they

inferre,

inferre, therefore the Church must needes be alwayes visible.

Campion. If it please you, though it be commonly alleaged, yet it is allegorical. There are many stronger places, and you were best take a more pregnant place, &c.

Goade. It is alleadged by Hosius, and others on your side, to this purpose, and therefore I chose it: notwithstanding, if you shunne it and would haue me to omitte it, I will.

Campion. No, I say there are apter and stronger places: neuertheless I shunne it not, but because of these hearers, wee should seeke most for edification, and it is the speciall cause of our meeting.

Goade. Thus then I reason:

This speciall place alleadged by those of your side, can not be vnderstoode of the Church: Ergo it proues not this visibilitie. 4. Argument.

Campion. I deny the Antecedent.

Goade. I would be glad, for the better waying of this place, that you would remember what your selfe hath written, concerning the finding out of the sense of any place of Scripture, in the second chapter of your booke. I would you had bene as reasonable in other things of your booke, & then we shoulde haue agreed better: for the rule is very good to helpe to the true sense, that the circumstances of the place be considered, the wordes that goe before, that followe after, the scope, the clauses, and whole context. Nowe both out of that which goeth before, and of that which followeth, out of the whole scope and drift of the place, it is euident to be spoken onely of the Apostles, and their successors in the ministerie: Ergo it is onely to bee vnderstoode of them, and not of the whole Church.

Camp. ratione secunda.
Hanc perueſtigemus ex verbis adiacentibus.
Voces, clauſulæ, tota connexio.

Campion. I deny the Antecedent.

Goade. Whatsoeuer is spoken properly of the Apostles doctrine and life, can not be vnderstoode of the whole Church:

But this is properly spoken of their doctrine and life:

Therefore it can not be vnderstoode of the whole Church.

Campion. You must not *petere principium*. It was not onely spoken in respect of the Apostles function, but of the whole Church, no otherwise then as the Apostles were Christians, including the whole Church.

Goade. Then that commaundement, *Bibite ex hoc omnes*,

Drinke ye all of this, spoken to the Apostles, much more must include the whole Church, being spoken of the Sacrament w^ich appertaineth to all, and yet ye exclude the people from the cuppe.

Campion. This was not spoken to them as they were Christians, but in respect of their function, as they were Priests: the other was spoken, as they were Christians.

Goade. Neither of these is true: but briefely deny one part of my argument.

Campion. I deny the *Minor*.

Goade. But of ỹ circumstances of the place and conclusion, it is manifest, that it is properly spoken of the Apostles doctrine and life, and not of the whole Church. Consider the wordes. *Vos estis sal terræ*, You are the salt of the earth. *Vos estis lux mundi, &c.* You are the light of the worlde. *Non potest ciuitas abscondi, &c.* A citie can not be hid. Then the conclusion: *Sic luceat lux vestra*, So let your light shine, &c. You are the salt of the earth, noteth the Apostles doctrine, wherewith they should season others. You are the light of the worlde, noteth their life, whereupon all mens eyes are cast, and so can no more be hid then a citie vpon an hill. Both these pointes are proper to the ministerie, and hereupon the conclusion inferred, So let your light shine, &c.

Campion. You haue very well answered your selfe: For the text conteineth both. There is the salt and the earth: the light and the world: who must season, and who must be seasoned: who must shine, and to whom they must shine. Do you not see plainely, that he includeth both the teachers, and them that are taught: &c.

Goade. Nowe you fall to discoursing cleane besides the purpose. It is true that the one can not be without the other, but yet it is plaine, that to season, to lighten, and to be set as vpon an hill, is proper alone to the Apostles and their ministerie. For the drift and scope of the place, is onely to set forth the Apostles doctrine and conuersation, & you violently wrest it to the whole Church. The life of the ministerie, is as it were set vpon an high stage, the light of their conuersation is looked vnto of al: what is this to the visibilitie of the whole Church?

Absurditie: ergo preceptes giuen to the M. his calling, are giuen to the familie.

Campion. Very wel, doth a candle shine to it selfe? and is not a master of a familie, a Master? and that which is spoken to him, may it not be said also to them?

Goade.

Goade. I pray you howe holdeth this argument: The life and doctrine of the ministerie is as it were set vpon a stage for all men to looke vnto, and therefore they are called the salte of the earth, the light of the worlde: Ergo the whole Church is visible. This is the force of your argument from this place.

Camp. I haue sayd, the text maketh not for you. It is not vnderstoode of their ministerie and life only, as they were Apostles, but as they were Christians.

Goade. As I haue proued this out of the text, so nowe I will shewe this to be the sense out of the Fathers, both Chrysostome and Ierome vpon the place.

Here M. D. Goade was turning for Chrys. vpon this place, and he willed that it might be shewed at the next meeting.

Campion. You may spare your labour, you shall neuer finde Doctor that vnderstandeth it onely of the ministerie: I tell you that aforehand.

Goade. Yes, I will shewe out of Chrysostome, that it is only vnderstoode of the ministerie, and of their life: in the afternoone according to your request, the place shalbe shewed.

Camp. It is a common and an vsuall kinde of speache, to vtter that to the maister, which is meant to the seruants.

Goade. Will you beleeue none but your selfe? hearken what Saint Hierome sayth vpon this place.

Camp. Yes, if you would beleeue Hierome, as well as I, we should be soone agreed. What thinke you, is Hierome of your religion? would you be of his?

Goade. I would not be of any mans religion, to builde vpon man. I holde neither of one nor other, but of Christ, and grounde my religion onely vpon his worde. But remember your strong place you spake of, to proue the perpetual visibilitie of the church. Let vs heare what it is.

Camp. Shall I then haue one argument?

Goade. Yea, let vs heare it: you shalbe answered, though it be not your part to oppose.

Campion. It is out of Matthew, chap. 18. *Dic Ecclesiæ*, Tell the Church. I will proue out of this place, that the Church of necessitie must continually be visible. I proue it thus.

This is a commaundement that is perpetuall, and must be alwayes executed in the Church:

But that can not be, vnlesse the Church be visible:

Ergo the visibilitie of the Church is continuall.

Goade. I distinguish of the maior. When the Church is gathered & may retaine a face, when it doeth execute gouernement, & hath a consistorie to heare matters, then it ought to be done: but this cannot be alwayes had, being often hindered by persecution.

Camp. Offences betweene brother & brother happen alwaies, and this is the medicine and remedy. There is no age, wherein there are not offences, & where shal I seeke the perpetual remedy that is appointed, vnles the Church be perpetually visible?

Goade. I haue said before. Whē there is a state, & an established Church, this remedy is to be sought for. But this cannot alwaies be had, because the militant afflicted church oftentimes can not be suffered to exercise this medicine of holsome discipline.

Camp. The disease is continuall, ergo the remedy is continual. I must tell my Prelates: where shall I tel thē, if they be not.

Goade. The remedy is continually necessary & holsome, but can not cōtinually be vsed. Diuers most necessary things are not alwayes in vse. It is most necessary the Gospel should be continually preached, it is Christes commandement, & yet this oftentime fayleth: as in persecution, whē the church is driuen into streights, and the publique exercise of the worde restrained. I deny your argument: It is alwayes necessary, therefore it is alwayes in vse and practise. Many other necessary thinges are wanting many times that ought to be, and yet this taketh them not away, neither maketh them vayne or vnnecessary, &c.

Ad nauseam vsque.

Campion. The disease is common: it is perpetuall. To whom shoulde I haue gone before Luthers time? What Prelats should I haue made my complaint vnto in those dayes? I must tell my Pastor, &c.

Goade. You are answered, that in times of persecution this could not be, and specially in those times of generall Apostacie foretolde by the Apostle, 2. Thess. 2. this could not be practised, no more then the true preaching of the worde. You deale straungely with vs. When you had shut vs in prison, embrewed your handes with our blood, driuē the true Church as it were into the wildernesse, through your grieuous persecutions and tyrannies, so as there coulde be no meetings for publike exercise of religion: then you aske where was our Church, and to whome we shoulde haue

gone

gone before Luthers times.

Campion. Where was your Church for 900. yeeres agoe? Whose were Iohn Husse? Hierome of Prage? the Waldenses? &c. Were they yours? Helpe him, Master Doctor.

Here Camp. after his bold maner did insolently insult by these vaine questions.

Fulke. It needeth not: this is beside the matter, your place is answered. The remedy is not vile or vayne, though sometimes men are restrayned from the vse of it. Cyprian complayneth aboue 1200. yeeres agoe, that for the great persecution that was against the Church, they could not meete so often as they desired, to execute discipline, and yet who will deny but the discipline of the Church is perpetuall? It must be vsed when it may bee had. A medicine is not an idle medicine in the Apothecaries shoppe, nor Galens prescription thereof is vayne, because sometimes it can not be had.

The discipline of the Church perpetuall & necessary, though it be not alwayes had & put in practise.

Campion. Though of some at sometimes it cannot be had in one place, yet it may be had in another. There may be some cases wherein I cannot tell where the Church is, to tell it: but if I will seeke it, I may finde it.

Therefore it is not alwayes visible.

Fulke. The words are spoken generally to euery man, *Si peccauerit aduersus te frater*, If thy brother offend against thee, &c: and yet euery man can not obteyne it. You that are in prison, what Church can you tell, if you be offended? will you say the remedy is vayne, because you can not vse it? Againe, there are meane remedies before a man come to this, that he should tell the Church: he must first giue priuate admonition, and before witnesses, which euery man can not do that is offended. As, to whom should Elias haue complayned, when hee knewe none but himselfe? Therefore it is no more necessary, that there should be a visible Church alwayes to complayne vnto: then it is necessary that euery man should alwayes bee able to admonish priuately, or to haue two or three witnesses to call vnto him. Againe, you answere your selfe, that there may be some cases wherein I can not tell where the Church is, to tell it. Therefore it was very ill concluded of you, that if a man can not alwayes haue a visible Church to make his complaynt vnto, the remedie prescribed by our Sauiour Christ, is vayne or idle. And concerning the name *Ecclesia* in that text, when it is sayde we should tell the Church, ye abuse the audience: for it meaneth not the whole Church, but

the consistorie and eldershippe, that haue the gouernement of euery particular congregation. For howe can a man tell the whole Church on earth, or yet the whole parish where he dwelleth: but he may tell the company of Elders and gouernors, when such are established to haue the execution of discipline, and this also may be interrupted by persecution.

Campion. Maister Doctor you haue sayde well for mee: the worde *Ecclesia* is taken for the gouernours of the Church, and they are alwayes in sight. In what place of the Scripture is the worde *Ecclesia* taken for an inuisible Church, you can shewe mee no place. Shewe mee one place: shewe mee one place if you can.

Fulke. I can shew you a great many. But because you call so earnestly for one, I will shewe you one.

It is taken for the whole body of the Church: therefore for an inuisible church, in the first chapter to the Ephesians, in the latter ende, where the Apostle sayeth, Καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου: And he appoynted him head ouer all thinges vnto his Church, which is his body, and the fulnes of him which filleth all in all. So that it is taken for the whole Catholike Church, as it containeth all the elect of God, those that haue bene, are, and shalbe, &c. which vniuersall Church is inuisible. Ephes. 1.

Camp. I graunt it is there taken for the Church triumphant and militant.

Fulke. Ergo it is there taken for an inuisible Church. For we speake of it as it conteyneth euery member, and is the whole body of Christ, whereof some are yet vnborne.

Campion. I graunt it of the whole: but the Church militant is visible, the other inuisible.

Fulke. But the Catholike Church of Christ being the body of Christ, is mysticall: ergo insensible.

Campion. Proove it according to all partes to bee inuisible.

Fulke. It is sufficient for mee to proove, that the Catholike Church, which is the whole body of Christ, is mystical: & therfore it is inuisible. I speake of the Catholike Church, as it is an article of faith. For, wee beleeue the Catholike Church according

to

to the articles of fayth: Nowe, fayth is of things which are not seene: ergo the Catholike Church is inuisible.

Campion. I knowe that the whole Catholike Church and euery part of the same, as it is of faith, is inuisible: but what is this to the Church militant?

Fulke. You vrged me to shewe a place where the word *Ecclesia* is taken for an inuisible Church: and I haue shewed you, that it is taken for an inuisible Church, whersoeuer it is taken for the Catholike Church, which you confesse to be inuisible, both in the whole, and euery part.

Campion. So farre as it is of faith.

Fulke. And we speake of it as it is of faith. For the whole Catholike Church, being an article of faith, is considered no otherwise then as it is of faith, neither any part thereof by your owne confession: whereof it followeth that the visible Church, for which you striue so much, is no article of our faith, because it is seen, faith being of things that are not seene. You haue graunted many absurdities this day, while you labour to defende that the Church on earth is alwaies visible. And now the conclusion is worst of al, that the visible Church (for which you are so earnest) is proued to be no article of faith.

Campion. Why may not a man see & yet beleeue. Peter saw him whom he beleeued, saying, thou art Christ the sonne of the liuing God, &c.

Fulke. That which hee sawe of Christ, was experimentall knowledge: but that which he confessed, Christ to be the sonne of God, was of faith, and not of sense. For flesh and blood reuealed it not vnto him, but God from heauen. That which Peter sawe of Christ with his bodily eyes, was seene of many vnbeleeuing Iewes, and of Iudas the traytor: but his confession (which came of faith) he had not by bodily sight, but by diuine reuelation. It is not of faith, to see men which are the members of the Church, but to see them as they are members of the Church, that is of faith: therfore that which is seene of the Church, is not of faith.

Camp. Why, you said the Church might be seene by experimentall fayth, as Peter saw Christ and beleeued.

Fulke. When said I so?

Campion. Euen now, when you spake of Peter.

Fulk. I neuer thought it, much lesse did I speake it. It is needfull there should be writing, els I see you would outface the matter: I said the cleane contrarie. That which Peter sawe of Christ, was experimentall knowledge, and not faith: that which he beleeued and confessed, he sawe not. Euen so I say, that which we beleeue and confesse in our Creede of the Catholike Church, wee neither do see, neither can we see.

Campion. I can see the whole world, though I cannot see it all at once: so I can see the Catholike Church in her partes, although I cannot see it all at once, or in one place.

Fulke. Whatsoeuer you can see at seuerall times, and in seuerall places of the Catholike Church, is no article of faith. For that which we beleeue of the Catholike Church, is not seene at any time, or in any place.

Campion. That is true.

Fulke. Ergo the whole Catholike Church, and euery part thereof, as it is of faith, is not visible.

Here *Campion* of himselfe brake vp.

Campion. Shall we meete againe. It were to be considered of what question we shall talke.

Here question being made, what point they should deale vpon, and being asked, whether he would defend the Church of Rome to be the true Church of Christ, he denied to medle therein, as being dangerous, vnlesse leaue might be obteined of her Maiesties most honourable Counsaile. Then being demanded, whether he would deale with that question in the after noone, Whether the Church might erre, he consented, the company present agreeing therunto. And so the houre was appointed at two of the clocke after dinner: the Replyers hauing no longer time to prouide their arguments.

In

The Question. whether the visible Church may erre.

FIrst, because promise was made in the forenoone that those places which were omitted, should bee shewed, D.Goade brought forth his place out of Chrysostome vpon Matth.5. *Rursus eos per ista ad bene viuendum ac diligẽtiam cohortatur, ostendens vt studeant esse soliciti, quasi ante omniũ oculos constituti, & in medio orbis terrarum theatro. Nolite inquit aspicere, quia in isto nunc residemus loco, in exigua sumus parte certaminis. Sic enim eritis manifesti cunctis quemadmodum ciuitas in montis vertice collocata, vel sicut lucerna in domo super candelabrũ relucens.* Againe by these things he exhorteth them by diligence of well liuing, that they might stande to be carefull as they that are set before all mens eies, and in the middest of the Theatre of the whole world. Do not you regard (saith he) that we remaine nowe in this place, and are but in a small part of our battle: for you shalbe so manifest to all men, as a citie placed vpon the top of a hil, or as a candle shining in a house vpon a candlestick, &c. Here you see by the iudgement of Chrysostome, expounding the place, that it onely respecteth the Apostles which you denied to day. For he exhorteth them to liue well, as those that are set in the sight and eyes of all, and therefore must be carefull howe they beare themselues vpon that open stage of the whole worlde, being as a citie vpon an hill.

Campion. The place is nothing against me, for it pertaineth to the whole Church. Doth Chrysostome cõtrary any thing spoken by me? doeth not their function, their faith and religion, their place shew that this is not spoken onely to them?

Goade. These are but wordes. It is plaine, hee noteth their doctrine by the salt, and their conuersation by the light.

Campion. He speaketh not any thing contrarie to that which I haue said.

Goade. Yes, you say the place meaneth the whole Church to proue the visibilitie thereof, as a citie set vpon an hill, can not bee hidde. Whereas Chrysostome interpreteth it of the Ministerie onely,

onely, as is manifest by ꝑ word Salt, & the whole drift of the place.

Campion. Of all other, first it belongeth to the Prelates, then to their flockes, as I haue shewed you by the example of a Master of a familie.

Goade. It belongeth in deede to the flocke also to liue well, but this place is not directed vnto them. It is absurde, against the whole scope of the place, to make a general cõclusion from a particular, from the Apostles to the whole Church.

Campion. The Apostles were faythfull, they include the whole Church, as they were Christians, and not Apostles.

Goade. Why then, that which was spoken to the Apostles, was likewise spoken to the Church. But it was sayd to the Apostles, Drinke you all of this: ergo to the whole Church.

Camp. That was personall, and in respect of their function, he spake onely in respect of those that were present, but there was none present but the Apostles: like that which was said to the Apostles, Go ye and preach to all nations, baptizing, &c. doeth he therefore commande the people also to preache and minister the Sacraments?

Goade. The case is farre vnlike. The receauing of the Sacramentes belong to all Christians: they must all receaue. And though preaching the word, and ministring, in respect of the function, be onely appropriate to the Apostles and Ministers: yet the word and Sacraments, are cõmon to al Christians. So by manifest difference it appeareth, that the cõmandement, Go & preach, is personall, belonging to one calling: and the commandement Drinke ye all of this, is generall to all the faithfull.

Absurde. The commandement in the institution bindeth Christians to receiue the cup. And Paul saith 1.Cor.11. That which I receiued of the Lord: whereby he teacheth that he had a commandement.

Camp. There is no place in the institution that commandes the common people to drinke, or not to drinke.

Goade. The Apostle (the best interpreter of Christes institution) applieth it to the whole Church, 1.Cor.11.verse 23. That which I receaued of the Lord, &c. And by the same reason you may say as was said before, there is no commandement to receaue the Communion.

Camp. There is no commandement in that institution, that the lay people should receiue the Communion.

Fulke. That is a shamefull absurditie. But nowe seeing the place is shewed, let vs come to the questiõ agreed vpon, Whether

the

the Church militant may erre: That it may erre, I proue thus.

Whatsoeuer erroꝛ is incident to euery member, is incident to the whole:

But it is incident to euery member to erre:

Ergo to the whole.

Campion. I deny both the Maior and Minor.

Fulke. Why, the Maior is from a place in Logique: that which is incident to euery part, must needes be incident to the whole: as euery part of a mans body, is subiect to coꝛruption, therefoꝛe the whole body is subiect to coꝛruption.

Absurde. Who can dispute with him that denieth the groundes of disputation?

Campion. There is no such place in Logique. Euery man may erre, but not the whole gathered together. Your example is not like: foꝛ the whole hath a promise, and so hath not euery particular man.

Fulke. The whole hath no promise that it shall not erre, moꝛe then euery particular member: foꝛ euery member of Christ hath the spirit of Christ, which is the spirit of trueth, and therefoꝛe the same promise that the whole hath.

Camp. Why, then there should be no heretikes.

Fulke. Yes, heretikes may be within the Church, but not of the Church: *Si ex nobis essent permansissent nobiscum* saith Saint Iohn, If they had bene of vs, they had abidden with vs.

Camp. They were of vs in apparance, & in outward shewe.

Fulke. I denie that they were of vs, though in outward profession they seemed to bee of vs: foꝛ in deede they were neuer of vs. Iohn 3. They went out from vs, but they were neuer of vs. And he addeth the reason: For, if they had bene of vs, they had remained with vs. They were within the Church, but they were neuer of the Church.

Campion. Christ saith of them that fall away in persecution, that they beleeued ỹ Gospel: therefoꝛe before persecution they were of vs, but they departed from vs, &c. they were of vs according to faith, though they were not according to election.

Fulke. Christ speaketh not there of true iustifying faith, noꝛ of the elect, but of those that beleeued foꝛ a time. Foꝛ if they had bene of vs, they would haue remained still with vs: but they were not of vs, neither according to iustifying faith, noꝛ according to election.

Campion. The meaning of Iohn is, they were not of vs accoꝛ-

ding to the election of God, yet they were of the militant Church, which conteineth good and euill.

Fulke. It is true, that in the visible Church be conteined both good and euill: but the elect onely are of the Church.

Camp. Why, what say you by Dauid when hee committed adulterie, was he elect and the childe of God?

Fulke. I say he did wickedly, but yet he was and remained elect, and the childe of God.

Camp. This is strange. But I say, when hee committed adulterie, he was the childe of the deuill: for it is plaine,

He that committeth sinne is the seruant of sinne:

But Dauid committed sinne:

Ergo he was the seruant of sinne and the childe of the deuill.

Goade. The meaning of the place is, that he that giueth him selfe ouer to sinne is the seruant of sinne, to be led wholy by it, in whom sinne reigneth. But no particular sinne in the elect, doeth make the children of God to become the children of the Deuil, neither doth separate them from the hope of saluation.

Fulke. He that is once a true member of Christ, can neuer become a member of the Deuill.

Campion. Then once good, and neuer euill.

Fulke. That followeth not. Hee may fall into euill, but neuer finally.

Goade. The place is to be vnderstoode of him that falleth of malice, and not of him that falleth by infirmitie.

Campion. He that falleth into adulterie, falleth malitiously: for he may resist if he will. For euery member of the Church hath power to withstand sinne if he will.

This discontented others also that stood by.

Fulke. Nowe, we shall haue free will.

Campion. I meane not of him selfe, but by grace. For when God hath giuen him grace, he may if he will resiste. Answere me this place, He is the seruant of sinne that committeth sinne.

Fulke. You were answered before.

Campion. Why then you holde, that a Catholike falling into adulterie is still the childe of God. I graunt that for euery offēce God doth not cast out his sonnes. For in a great house, *In magna domo*, there be many sonnes, which though they be disobediēt, they cease not to be sonnes till they be cast out, &c. but when they are cast out, they are no more the sonnes of God.

Fulke.

Fulke. God casteth out none of his sonnes. For, if they bee sonnes, they are also heyres. They are the Apostles wordes.

Camp. I say they are sonnes for the time, which are cast out. *Eijcit in exteriores tenebras.* He casteth them out into vtter darknes. He that had not the nuptiall garment, maketh this claime to be the sonne of God, and sitteth downe amongst Gods children, but he is cast out into vtter darkenes.

Fulk. But he was neuer any sonne, but an hypocrite, & therfore no maruaile if he were cast out: S. Paul saith, ꝑ a sonne is an heire.

Camp. Why, are not all that are baptized the sonnes of God?

Fulke. No, for they haue not all the spirit of adoption.

Camp. Why then, what iudge you of infants that die without Baptisme, or immediatly after they are baptized: are they not the children of God?

Fulke. I take not vpon me to iudge. But if they be not Gods elect, baptisme cannot make them his children.

They may be reconed borne within the couenant, but they are not his children, if they be not elected, though we iudge thē not: because their not being elected, doth not appeare vnto vs.

Camp. Then Christ commanded baptisme in vayne, if it saue not those that are baptized.

Fulke. That is not so: for there is a necessary vse of baptizing, though the holy Ghost bee not giuen to euery one that receyueth baptisme. I baptize with water (sayth Iohn Baptist) but Christ baptizeth with the holy Ghost.

Camp. I wil proue that infants are without sinne, & therefore must needes be saued. For if they haue sinne, they must either haue originall sinne, or actual sinne: but being baptized, they haue neither of both: (for originall sinne is taken away by baptisme, & as for actual sinne, they neuer cōmitted any) ergo they are without sinne.

Fulke. Originall sinne is not taken away from any in this life, but it is not imputed to the elect.

M. Lieutenant, M. Doctours, the question that was appointed before dinner, was, Whether the visible Church may erre.

Goade. M. Lieutenant, he continually draweth vs into newe questions to auoide the matter in controuersie. Shall I enter that question? I wil recite some churches in the Apostles times, & aske your iudgemēt of thē, & then go to mine argumēt. The Churches of Corinth & of Galatia, what say you to thē? The Church of Corinth (though they had a promise, as you said) did erre about ꝑ matter of resurrectiō: ꝑ church of Galatia, about ꝑ matter of iustificatiō

Camp. The Apostle though he wrote to al, yet he meaneth but some few of them. And what are these to the whole Church, being but particular churches? the militant Church of Christ cõprehendeth the whole number of churches on earth. As for the error of ỹ church of Galatia, it was no otherwise reproued then as preachers are wõt to reproue, who are wõt to rebuke al for some ỹ are faulty.

Goade. In deede you say some thing concerning that of Corinth. I grant ỹ the error was not so generall. For he sayd, *Quidã inter vos, &c.* Certaine amongst you, &c. But for the Galathians it was otherwise. For the whole Church was iustly reproued, according to that, O you foolish Galathians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not beleeue the trueth? These wholy fell & were not particular mẽbers, but whole Churches, planted by the Apostles thẽselues, replenished with speciall gifts of ỹ holy Ghost. And if these failed in the Apostles time, & in so great a matter, what priuiledge haue any other churches since, that they should not likewise erre, & so cõsequently what priuilege hath ỹ militãt church?

Campion. Make your argument, and then we shall see what ye will conclude.

Goade. So then I make mine argument.

The second argument.

Whatsoeuer congregation doth erre in matters of faith, is not the true Church:

But the Church of Rome erreth in matters of faith:

Ergo the Church of Rome is not the true Church.

Campion. This is from the question. M. Lieutenant might do well to put vs in minde of the question.

Goade. I remember the question wel. I bring an instance according to your meaning, because you in saying that the Church cãnot erre, meane ỹ the church of Rome cãnot erre: this priuilege agreeth not to ỹ church of Rome, which you say is ỹ true Church.

Camp. I deny your Minor. The Church of Rome hath not erred. You suppose the Church of Rome to be the true Church, and I beleeue it.

Goad. Indeed I only suppose it for disputatiõs sake, & beleue it not: but ỹ errors are infinite, & I should weary my selfe & all the company, to rehearse many. I omit inferior errors of lesse waight and moment, and come to those that shake the foundation of faith.

Campion. We shall then runne into all controuersies: bring

some

some proper errour that I my selfe shall confesse to be an errour, that the church of Rome holdeth.

Goade. Why a generall must be taken away by particulars.

Campion. That is true.

Goade. Then I reason thus. It hath erred, & doeth erre in ỹ foundation, touching saluatiõ by Christ: ergo it is subiect to error.

Campion. It doeth not, God forbid it should. But if you will properly proue it hath erred, shewe me that some generall Councill hath erred.

Goade. Well, I will follow you in this poynt. The Councill of Trent hath erred in many poyntes of doctrine, and namely in the matter of iustification: ergo a generall Councill hath erred.

Campion. I deny the Antecedent, &c.

Goade. It ascribeth whole or part of righteousnesse to be inherent in our selues:

But this is an errour:

Ergo it erreth in iustification, &c. The very wordes I do not remember, but this is the effect of the doctrine, that *inhærens iustitia est pars iustificationis*, That inherent righteousnesse is a part of iustification.

Campion. The Councill hath no such wordes, or if it haue, it doth not ascribe any thing to righteousnes cleauing in our selues, as of our selues, but as giuen of God. In deede it is in vs, but as ỹ gift of God. As there are vertues, faith, hope & charitie, which must be in vs seruing to this righteousnes, which yet are not of vs. Here was promise that the place should be shewed.

Goade. Whatsoeuer is in vs that must iustifie vs before the iust iudgement of God, must be perfect:

But our righteousnes is not perfect:

Ergo our righteousnes cãnot either in whole or part iustifie vs.

Campion. I answere your Maior: it must be perfect, according to that perfection that God requireth of vs in this life.

Goade. This is most corrupt. For God will haue a perfect and vndefiled righteousnes, such as he hath set downe in his owne law. *Qui fecerit, &c.* He that shall do them, shall liue in them. Gal. 3. Againe, *Maledictus est omnis, qui non permanserit in omnibus quæ scripta sunt in libro Legis, vt faciat ea, &c.* Curfed is euery one that abideth not in all thinges that are written in that booke, to doe them, &c.

Campion. I say, God doeth not exact such a perfect righteousnesse according to the lawe, for we are deliuered from that by Christ, &c.

Goade. Then we must rest on Christ alone: but if we will be iustified by any part of righteousnes in our selues, it must be perfect. For Gods iustice alloweth no vnperfect righteousnes. Doe you thinke you can fulfil this law? &c.

Campion. Yea that I can.

Goade. Can you loue God aboue all things, & your neighbour as your selfe? Can you loue him with all your heart, with all your soule, and with all your strength?

Campion. I can. For when I preferre God before all things, and loue him chiefely, I loue him aboue all.

Fulke. Note that blasphemous absurditie.

Goade. If a man may fulfill the lawe to iustification, then Christ dyed in vayne.

Here there was a litle whispering amonges the company, as if it had bene a soft hissing.

Campion. What now, shall we haue hissing? &c.

Goade. Sure it is worthie of hissing, and of blushing too, if you had any feare of God before your eyes, or conscience. I praye God make you to vnderstand the absurdities that you holde, that you may be ashamed of them, and renounce them.

Campion. Why, is euery motion to sinne deadly sinne? &c.

Goade. You are like ỳ Pharisee, that thought the keeping of the law to consist in the outward letter. What say you, is not concupiscence, & the motions of the flesh against ỳ lawe of God, sinne?

Campion. No that they are not: for if I being tempted, refraine my selfe, and when I haue a motion to euill, hyde my selfe from it: as, if I see my neyghbours goods, and haue a motion to steale, and do not, do I not herein loue my neighbour as my selfe? If a man bee in the Queenes Jewell house, where he may take some precious thing, and hyde himselfe of it and abstaine, shal this man be condemned? What will you condemne a man for euery litle tentation? It is a good thing to be tempted. &c. Iam. 1. Blessed is he that endureth temptation.

Scripture most absurdly applyed.

Goade. Ye abuse the place. For it is vnderstood of afflictions. And as for concupiscence, it is the transgression of the lawe: Thou shalt not lust, ergo it is sinne. But I will leaue this as impertinent to the purpose. Consider that notable place in the ende of the

fift

fift chapter to the Corinth. Epiſt. 2. Him that knewe no ſinne he made ſinne for vs, that we might be made the righteouſneſſe of God in him, not in our ſelues, to ſhewe that it is no righteoulnes cleauing in vs but in Chriſt, & is made ours by imputation, euen as our ſinnes were imputed to Chriſt: conſider the place hereafter with your ſelfe.

Fulke. Marke here his abſurdities. Firſt he holdeth, that hee can keepe the lawe in ſuch perfection as God requireth: and hee can loue God with all his heart, with all his ſoule, and with all his ſtrength, and his neighbour as himſelfe. Secondly, he affirmeth that though he haue a luſt to ſteale, yet if hee hidle that luſt, hee loueth his neighbour as him ſelfe. Thirdly, he holdeth that we are iuſtified by inherent righteouſnes, which he thinketh to colour by the grace and gift of God. But neuertheleſſe, ye are in the caſe of the Phariſee, Luke 18. which truſteth in his owne righteouſnes, & yet aſcribeth all to the grace of God, ſaying, I thanke thee, &c. He boaſted not before men, but humbly gaue thankes vnto God, acknowledging his righteouſnes to be Gods gift, and yet Chriſt tolde this parable againſt him and ſuch as hee is, which truſt in themſelues that they are righteous, that is, by iuſtice inherent, although they confeſſe they haue it by the grace and gift of God. Campions abſurdities.

Campion. But this was of pride that hee gloried in his righteouſnes, and therefore the parable is told againſt himſelfe.

Fulke. I graunt that he was proude, and ſo are all iuſticiaries that truſt in themſelues that they are righteous, howſoeuer they would cloke their pride, by aſcribing it to the gift of God: but he is condemned for truſting in himſelfe that he was righteous, that is, for inherent righteouſnes, which neuertheleſſe he aſcribed not to his owne ſtrength, but to the grace of God, ſaying, I thanke thee God, &c. But I will go to an another argument.

Campion. I pray you let me anſwere this argument firſt, for it ſhalbe reported that I ſaid this and that, and my wordes ſhalbe depraued. I ſay therefore, there are two wayes of iuſtification: one in vs, another without vs. Chriſt is a cauſe of iuſtification by his grace and merite without vs, and ſo we are iuſtified by baptiſme: and we are iuſtified by the giftes of God in vs, faith, hope, and charitie. how ſay you, were not theſe my words? And why then do you challenge me for ſaying we are iuſtified by Gods righteouſneſſe,

faith,

faith, hope, and charitie, which is within vs. For how say you, are we not iustified by faith: and is not faith within vs?

Fulke. I challenged you for blasphemous absurditie, in saying you could loue God with all your heart, with all your soule, and strength. And albeit hope and charitie follow that same faith, (by which we are iustified) in the regenerate that are the children of God: yet we are not iustified by them, no nor by faith, otherwise then instrumentally, as by apprehending the righteousnesse of Christ, which is without vs, and is no otherwise ours then by imputation. And howe can you loue God with all your heart &c. when you can not giue him an entire loue, according to his lawe?

Campion. I saide a man may loue God with all his heart in this life, according to his lawe, when hee doeth preferre God before all the thinges in the worlde: as when a man doeth chiefely preferre him, &c.

Fulke. But can you loue God onely?

Campion. A man loueth God onely, when hee loueth him chiefely, &c.

Fulke. Chiefely and only is all one: write that.

Campion. Why, thinke you the lawe was giuen to no purpose? I am sure it was giuen to be fulfilled, and we are not bidden to keepe it, if it were impossible.

Fulke. The lawe was giuen for an other cause, then that wee should be iustified by fulfilling it: namely, to shew vs our infirmitie, that we may be conuicted of sinne.

Campion. That is a wise cause in deede. Belike a father cõmandeth his children, not that they should do his will, but because he would haue them to see that they can not do it.

Fulke. As though almightie God can haue none other ende of giuing commandements, then mortall men vse to haue. But this is not to the question. I would goe forward with an other argument, if you would suffer me.

Camp. You will giue me leaue to declare my meaning.

Fulke. Belike you haue an yll opinion of the auditorie, that they can vnderstand nothing, except you tel it them twenty times ouer. If you will not suffer me to proceede, I must desire Maister Lieutenant to commaunde you.

3. Argumẽt. If a generall Council may erre, then the Church may erre:

But

But a generall Councill may erre:
Therefore the Church may erre.

Campion. I denie the Minor.

Fulke. A generall Councill may be corrected, as Augustine saith: therefore it may erre.

Campion. It may be declared or explaned, but not corrected by a contrary decree.

Fulke. Will you heare the place: it is Tom.6.lib.2.*contra Donatistas cap.3. Quis autem nesciat sanctam Scripturam canonicam tam veteris quam noui Testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri, eamq; omnibus posterioribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, vt de illa omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, vtrum verum vel vtrum rectum sit, quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit. Episcoporũ autem literas, quæ post confirmatum Canonem vel scriptæ sunt, vel scribantur, & per sermonem fortè sapientiorem cuiuslibet in ea re peritioris, & per aliorum Episcoporum grauiorem auctoritatem doctiorumq; prudentiam, & per Concilia licere reprehendi, siquidem eis forte a veritate deuiatum est. Et ipsa Concilia quæ per singulas regiones vel prouincias fiunt, plenariorum Conciliorum auctoritati quæ fiunt ex vniuerso orbe Christiano, sine vllis ambagibus cedere: ipsaq; plenaria sæpe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, & cognoscitur quod latebat, sine vllo typho sacrilegæ superbiæ, sine vlla inflata ceruice arrogantiæ, sine vlla contentione liuidæ inuidiæ, cum sancta humilitate, cum pace catholica, cum charitate Christiana.* That is to say, Who knoweth not, that the holy Canonicall Scripture, both of the old & new Testamẽt is cõteined within her certain bounds, and that the same is so preferred before all latter writings of Bishops, that of it there can not be any doubt or questiõ at al, whether it be true or whether it be right, whatsoeuer is certainely knowen to be written therein. But that the letters of Bishops, which since the canon cõfirmed, either haue bene writtẽ, or be now in writing, may be reprehẽded both by the saying which is perhaps more wise, of any mã that is more skilful in that matter, & also by the more graue auctority & wisdom of other bishops, that be better learned, if any thing in them perhaps be declined out of the way of trueth. And that euen those Councils which are held in euery region or prouince, without al doubt must giue

place to general Councils, which are gathered of all the Christian world: and that euen the generall Councils them selues are often corrected, the former by the latter, when by any tryall of things, that is opened which was shut vp, and that is knowen which was hidden, without any swelling of sacrilegious pride, without any stiffe necke of arrogancie, without any contention of malicious enuie, with holy humilitie, with Catholike peace, with Christian charitie. Here you haue a plaine place, that onely the Scripture can not erre, that al others writers may erre, that all prouinciall Councils may erre, and last of all, generall Councils them selues may be corrected, the former by the latter: therefore without question they may erre.

Campion. I answered before you read, that a general Councill may be declared and better explaned, but not corrected.

Fulke. It may be amended, and therefore corrected. There is no difference betweene amending and correcting.

And yet who knoweth not that generall Coũcils haue bene contrary one directly against another Here the Papists in a libell brought out of Lãcashire, do report this far otherwise, as they do all the rest: but none truely, they that were present can tell.

Camp. So farre forth it may be corrected, as it may be better explaned, but not to set out things that are contrary. For generall Councils are not one contrary to the other.

Fulke. Saint Augustine sayeth, The generall Councill may be ignorant of some thing at the beginning, that afterwardes by experience may be amended: some thing may be close, which afterwarde may be opened: it may be hid to one Councill, that may be knowen of another. And the Antithesis in these wordes must needes stand, that only the Scriptures cannot erre, and therefore are not to be corrected. As for Councils generall and prouincial, and Bishops writings of al sorts, may be corrected, and therefore they may erre.

Campion. A generall Councill may erre in matter of fact, as in condemning and absoluing some Bishops, &c. but it cannot erre in matters of doctrine.

Fulke. Doe you knowe whereof Augustine speaketh in this place? &c.

Camp. Yea, as well as you.

Fulke. Why then, declare it before this companie.

Campion. He speaketh of a matter of fact.

Fulke. Nowe you shewe your selfe altogether ignorant of the matter: for he speaketh of ꝑ Councill of Carthage, that was

holde

holde in Cyprians time, wherein was concluded an erroꝛ of faith. Foꝛ they had decreed, that such were to be rebaptized, as had bin baptized of heretikes. With which decree, and Cyprians authoꝛitie (who was Pꝛesident of the Councill) when Saint Augustine was pꝛessed, he answereth, that onely the Scripture coulde not erre, but all other both Bishops writings, and Councils might erre, and therefoꝛe might be refoꝛmed, &c.

Camp. He speaketh not of a matter of faith, as appeareth by the woꝛd experiment. Foꝛ there can be no experiment in a matter of faith: heresie can not be amended.

Fulke. These are vaine shiftes. We may finde by experience they haue erred.

Campion. The woꝛde amending, sheweth that it was in maners.

Fulke. To be coꝛrected and amended is all one, and may bee as well in faith as in manners, and the argument whereof he entreateth, and the Antithesis he maketh betwene the Scriptures, and all other authoꝛities, sheweth plainely, that he meaneth of errour of faith. But seeing you haue nothing else to answere, I will leaue it to the consideration of them that be wise and learned, and so long as you bring no matter, I will not answere your woꝛdes.

Goad. Seeing you stande vpon Councils, I will pꝛoceede that way.

Generall Councils haue erred, ergo, &c. 4. Argum.

Camp. I denie the Antecedent.

Goade. They are contrary one to another, &c.

Camp. I deny it.

Goade. The Councill of Constantinople, and the Councill of Nice are contrary.

Camp. They are not.

Goade. They are contrary in the matter of Images, namely the Councill of Constantinople condemning the setting vp of Images in the Church: and the Councill of Nice afterwarde allowing Images.

Here for lacke of the booke present, it was referred to the shewing of the place afterward.

Campion. You can not shewe, that they were contrary one to another.

Goade. It shalbe shewed afterward. I will come to another

generall Councill. The Councill of Constance hath erred in matter of faith: ergo a generall Councill hath erred.

Campion. I denie the Antecedent.

Goade. The Councill of Constance erred in taking away the cuppe from the common people: this was a matter of faith: ergo that Councill erred in matter of faith.

Campion. Thus we shall runne into all questions, and then we shal haue done this time twelue moneths. This was no error in the Councill: for I say there is no commaundement that the people should be partakers of the cuppe.

Goade. By the same reason you may aswell exclude the people from the bread also, but though you haue in this point denied the force of Christes institution: yet the commandement in the same is plaine, *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, Drinke ye all of this. And Paul interpreteth it so, 1. Cor. 11. deliuering aswell the cuppe as the bread to the whole Church, euen as he had receiued of the Lorde. The Councill of Constance decreeth against it: ergo a manifest and foule errour in that Council.

Campion. Doeth Saint Paul make it a precept that the lay people should receiue the cuppe?

Goade. Paul indued with the spirit of God, giueth a flat precept in the same chapter, verse 28. *Probet seipsum homo*, Let a mã try him selfe, and so let him eat of that bread, and drinke of that cuppe. These are plaine precepts, Let him eat, Let him drinke: and here is as great a commandement to the whole Church for the one, as for the other.

Campion. The place is to be vnderstoode, when he doeth receiue, and vnder the obedience of the Church, it may be done. And this that you make so much a doe about, I haue seene it done to many Catholikes my selfe: but it is not so necessary, that you should make such a doo about it.

Goade. It is not left free, but an expresse commaundement, and therefore necessary. It is the Imperatiue mode, and therefore a commandement. I maruayle howe you can stande in this, being so plaine?

Fulke. Here are two thinges, *Probet, & Edat, & bibat*, Let him examine him selfe, and let him eate and drinke, and both be commaundements. First, he must be prepared, and

then

then he must eate, and not onely eate, but he must drinke also. For as the institution is of eating and drinking, so is the commandement of the Apostle drawen from the institution. And if there be no commandement, then is no man bounde to receiue the Lords Supper.

Camp. No, it is a thing indifferent by the institutiō touching the common people, sauing that onely the authoritie of ỹ Church hath layde it vpon vs: here you may see ỹ authoritie of the church, in things not commanded.

Absurde. For there is as great necessitie of the one Sacrament as the other.

Goade. It is a commandement, both in the institution and by the Apostle, 1. Corinth. 11. saying, That which I receiued, I deliuered: grounding his commandement vpon the institution, and therefore commanded in the institution.

Campion. Yea, he saith when he will, or when he doth receiue, then let him examine him selfe.

Fulke. These are your owne wordes, there is no such worde here. When hee will, and when he doeth, he must proue him selfe, and so he must eate. The words which the Apostle vseth here, are both the imparatiue mode in the Greeke text: Let him examine himselfe, and let him eate and drinke.

Campion. I graunt there are two preceptes, but this is the summe and ende, *Vt dignè edat*, That he may eate worthily.

The Greeke testament being reached vnto him, he refused to reade it in the Greeke.

Fulke. Here is the booke, see it and reade it: this is the originall, giue him the booke, it is a reasonable great print.

Camp. You are still urging mee to reade Greeke, what childish dealing is this, can I not see the imparatiue mode aswell in the Latine as in the Greeke, shall this disaduantage the cause? I haue (I thanke God) and you shal know it, almuch Greeke as wil serue my turne, and when there is occasion to vse it, I will shewe it. But is not ỹ Latin tongue as good a tongue as ỹ Greeke? &c.

All this is but a vaine brag: for his sight in Greeke was very litle or none at al, as may appeare in the first dayes conference, here also, and afterwards.

Fulke. You were best confesse your ignorance. We make not tongues the measure of the trueth, but we bring the originall to preuent your cauillations, and your finding fault with translations. But I will deale with you with an other argument.

The whole Church did thinke it necessarie for infantes to receiue:

Ergo the whole Church hath erred, &c.

Argumēt, 5.

Campion. Nowe wee shall haue a question whether infantes

may receaue, so we shall runne into all questions.

Fulke. Not so. But I will proue that Innocentius Bishop of Rome, and all the Church with him, as S. Augustine confesseth, held this error, that it is necessary for infantes to receiue the communion, which you your selfe holde to bee an error, seeing you affirme it is not of necessitie by Christes commandement, that any lay men should receiue it. You shal heare the wordes of Augustine and of Innocentius both, as Augustine citeth them. Why, are you afraide of the place before you come at it, let me reade it. Saint Augustine citeth the wordes of Innocentius, out of his Epistle to the Bishops of Numidia, *Lib. 2. ad Bonifacium contra duas epist. Pelag. cap. 4. Hæc enim eius verba sunt. Illud vero quod eos vestra fraternitas asserit prædicare, paruulos æternæ vitæ præmijs etiam sine baptismatis gratia posse donari, perfatuum est. Nisi enim manducauerint carnem filij hominis, & biberint sanguinem eius, non habebunt vitam in semetipsis: qui autem hanc eis sine regeneratione defendunt, videntur mihi ipsum baptismum velle cassare.* For these are his wordes. But where as your brotherhoode affirmeth them to preache, that litle children may bee rewarded with the gift of eternall life, euen without the grace of Baptisme, it is a very foolish thing. For except they shal eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his blood, they shall haue no life in themselues. But they which defende this vnto them without regeneration, seeme to me that they wil make frustrate baptisme it selfe. Upon which wordes of Innocentius, Saint Augustine inferreth, *Ecce, beatæ memoriæ Innocentius papa, sine baptismo Christi, & sine participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi, vitam non habere paruulos dicit.* Beholde, the Pope Innocent of blessed memorie saith, that little children cannot haue life without the participation of the body and blood of Christ. In these wordes Saint Augustine sheweth the generall practise of the Church was, that infantes shoulde receaue, because it was thought necessarie vnto saluation.

Here Campiō interrupted him, saying, there was no such place & made much a doe.

Campion. It was onely a practise, it was no opinion of necessitie of saluation.

Fulke. Saint Augustine writeth against the Pelagians, that helde that Baptisme was not necessarie for infantes, and that infants might be saued without Baptisme, against whome hee reasoneth thus. Infantes can not bee saued without they receaue the

Augustins argument.

commu-

communion: but they cannot receiue the communion vnles they be first baptized: ergo infants cannot be saued vnlesse they be baptized. And to proue that they cannot be saued except they receaue the communion, hee alleaged the decree or diffinitiue sentence of Innocentius.

Campion. Saint Augustine saith not, that the whole Church thought it necessary to saluation. But when Innocētius commanded that infants should communicate, it was but a necessitie of the commandement, the necessitie was not in the thing, but to keepe the vnitie of the church, and so no error of faith, but a lawful practize of the Church: but shewe the decree.

Fulke. You haue heard the words of Innocentius, out of his synodicall Epistle, and thus Saint Augustine citeth his decree: *Ecce, beatæ memoriæ Innocentius papa, sine baptismo Christi, &c.* Loe, Innocentius the Pope of blessed memorie, &c.

Campion. There is no such decree: I will beleeue none of your notes. He saith they bee damned vnles they be baptized, but he saith not, they be damned except they receiue the communion.

Fulke. He saith both: you shall see the booke, seeing you will not credit my notes.

Here the booke was promised to be brought & the place to be shewed.

Goade. Upon supposition as before, I will suppose as you beleeue cōcerning the church of Rome: The head (as you hold him) of that Church, hath erred in matter of faith: ergo the Church being the members, are subiect to error.

6. Argumēt.

Campion. I denie your Antecedent.

Goade. Saint Peter did erre in faith, and that, after the sending downe of the holy Ghost vpon him and the rest: therefore the principall head of the Church, as you accompt of Peter.

Campion. He did not erre in faith. I knowe the place, Gal. 2. It was a matter of maners not of doctrine. For it was but a litle dissimulation.

Goade. It was matter of doctrine, for it was somewhat concerning that, where about the Coūcill was gathered at Hierusalem touching Circumcision.

Campion. Ye vtterly mistake it, for it was about the obseruation of the Lawe by the Gentiles, and not concerning Circumcision.

Goade. I nowe well remember, it was not directly about the question

question of Circumcision. But it is certaine, Peter was in that error, that the Gospel pertained not at all to the Gentiles, vntill hee was reformed by vision, Act. 10. For then at length he said, *Nunc tandem comperio, &c.* Now at length I finde, &c: so he was for a time in error. But for the place, Gal. 2. it is saide, *Non ambulauit recto pede ad veritatem euangelij.* Hee walked not with a right foote according to the trueth of the Gospel, &c.

Camp. It was but a smal matter of dissimulation in maners.

Goade. The text saith, Paul withstoode him to the face, because he was blame worthy, and iustly to be reproued: therefore it was no small matter. And Augustine against Hierome, *De Petro iure reprehenso, Epist. 19.* doth iustifie this open reproofe by S. Paul, though Hierome laboured to lessen this faulte, &c.

Campion. And so do I. But this proueth not that it was any matter of faith.

Fulke. It was against the trueth of the Gospel:

Trueth is contrary to error:

Ergo it was an error of faith.

Camp. I haue said the fault was in maners, for dissimulation. When I sawe that he did not walke well, or right, &c. as at this day any poore Priest may tell the Pope, seeing the Pope to erre in maners, and may say vnto him, Syr, why do you so?

Fulke. But that is against your owne Canon Law. For what so euer the Pope doth, no man may say: Syr, why did you so?

Here it was promised that it shoulde be shewed.

Campion. I thinke there can be shewed no such words in the Lawe.

Fulke. I pray you answere mee, Did Peter dissemble against his cõscience, or with it? Surely he did it not for any worldly respect, but because he thought it was his dutie in so doing to beare with the weakenes of the Iewes, & to thinke ỹ a man may dissemble in such a case, is a matter of faith: therefore his error was a matter of faith, and not of fact onely.

Camp. Why, in some case the Catholikes thinke they may communicate with you, come to your churches, & you againe cõmunicate wt vs, & go to our churches, dispute & conferre wt vs, &c.

Fulke. I woulde wish you to conteine your selfe, I knowe where you are. It is a matter that doth not belong vnto you. You haue vttered a thing you ought to be silent in. If it is a matter of state, it were best for you to leaue such things.

Camp.

Camp. I meane to dispute, what, to you threaten?

Fulke. No, but I giue you good counsaile, I am more your friende then you are aware of. I thinke, you are alreadie founde deepe enough in such matters. But to another argument.

The generall Councill confesseth that it may erre:
Ergo the Church may erre.

The seuẽth Argument.

Camp. In deede this is to the point, if you can proue it.

Fulke. Answere directly, and you shall see I will proue it so, as you shall not be able to auoyde it. The whole councill prayeth in the end of euery general Council, in a set forme of prayer, that God will pardon their error: ergo they cõfesse they may erre, &c. for thus they say, *Te in nostris principijs occursorem poposcimus, te quoque in hoc fine iudiciorum nostrorum, pro excessibus indultorem adesse precamur, scilicet vt ignorantiæ parcas, et errori indulgeas, &c.* This is the very forme of their prayer. We prayed that thou wouldest be an ayder in our beginnings, thee also in this ende of our iudgements we pray to be present as a pardoner of our excesse, that is to say, that thou wouldest spare our ignorance, and pardon our error. Here you see plainely, they confesse they may erre, when they desire pardon of their errors.

This D. Fulke read out of his note booke. *Concilior. Tom. primo de ord. celeb. concilii.*

Campion. Master Doctor, they pray against your errors, do they not? that God would pardon your errors.

Fulke. They pray, that if they thẽselues haue erred, they may be pardoned, they speake of their own errors committed in their owne Councill, and the wordes that follow doe plainely expresse the same.

Camp. I would see the printed booke, & first, I would know whether they speake of any error of faith: then secondly, I would knowe if it can be shewed wherein the Councill erred.

Fulke. Seeing the Councill by this prayer confesseth that it may erre, what neede it be shewed wherein it erred.

Campion. Was this prayer said in the Councill of Trent?

Fulke. I knowe not, but it is the prayer that is appointed to be said after euery Councill.

Camp. I answere, the Councill of Trent will not acknowledge any error: it was some matter of facte.

Fulke. Their wordes are plaine that they may erre, not only in facte, but also in faith: & therefore they pray to be pardoned in both. *Et quia conscientia remordente tabescimus, ne aut ignorantia*

nos traxerit in errorem, aut præceps forsitan voluntas impulerit iustitiam declinare, ob hoc te poscimus, te rogamus, vt si quid offensionis in hac Concilij celebritate contraximus, condonare ac remissibile facere digneris. And because our owne conscience accusing vs we do faint, least either ignorance hath drawen vs into error, or hasty will perhaps hath driuē vs to decline from iustice, we pray thee, we beseech thee, that if we haue committed any offence in the celebration of this Council, thou wouldest vouchsafe to forgiue it, and to make it pardonable.

Campion. That very worde declareth, that they meane of some error in facte, & not of doctrine. They pray, that if they haue ignorantly erred from iustice, they might be pardoned.

Fulke. Those things which the Councill doeth wisely distinguish, you doe vnwisely confounde. They acknowledge, that ignorance might drawe them into error, and heady will draw them from iustice, they distinguish error from iniustice, and desire to be pardoned of both. As for the booke, it shall be brought. We could not haue bookes here, for we agreed vpon the question but immediatly before dinner, and could not go out of the place since for bookes, but it shall be shewed.

M. Lieutenant. Here M. Lieutenant told them the time was past: but M.D. Fulke desired to haue one argument more.

2. Argum. Fulke. The Councill of Nice 2. decreed an error, therefore the Church may erre.

Camp. Nowe we shall haue the matter of Images.

Fulke. You are *Nimis acutus*, you will leape ouer the stile or euer you come at it: I meane not to speake of Images.

Camp. Well then, I denie the Antecedent.

Fulk. The Synode decreed, that Angels, Archangels, soules of men, &c. haue bodyes, are visible & circumscriptible, and this is an error: ergo they decreed an error, &c.

Camp. They decreed no such thing.

Fulke. You shall heare the words of the Council, *Actione 1.* First, ỹ saying of one Iohānes, Bishop of Thessalonica, was read in these wordes. *De angelis & archangelis & eorum potestatibus quibus & nostras animas adiungo, ipsa Catholica ecclesia sic sentit, esse quidem intelligibiles, sed non omnino corporis expertes & inuisibiles.* Concerning Angels and Archangels, and the powers of them,

them,to which also I adioyne our soules,the Catholike Church her selfe doeth so thinke,that they are in deede intelligible, but not altogether without bodyes,and inuisible. Which wordes of Iohānes Thessalonicēsis,the Archbishop of Constantinople Tharasius,who was prolocutor of the Council,abridgeth,and concludeth vpon them,saying, *Ostendit autem pater,quod & angelos pingere oporteat,quando circumscribi possunt & vt homines apparuerunt.* This father hath shewed that we must paint the Angels also,seeing they may be circumscribed,& haue appeared as men. *Sacra Synodus dixit,Etiam Domine.* The holy Synode sayd, Yea my lorde. Here you see the decree of the whole Synode approuing the saying of Iohannes Thessalonicensis, and the cōclusion of Tharasius thereupon.

Campion. Shewe me the decree, and let me see the Canon. many things are spoken in Councils that are not the Canons.

Fulke. I haue read the decree.

Camp. Shew me the Canon,reade their Canon.

Fulk. As though euery Council hath set forth Canōs: many Councils haue no Canons,neither hath this any ẏ I know. You shew your selfe a man well read in the Councils, ẏ wil exact Canons of euery Council:but this was ẏ consent & the agreemēt of the whole Council,the whole Council answered, *Etiam domine.*

Camp. Shewe me the booke.

Fulke. If I doe not shew it,then let me beare the blame.

Camp. Wel,admit it be so : first,they might meane that Angels and spirits had a certaine definite substance of their being, which they called their bodies.

Fulke. Then belike they knew not how to speake : but I am sure,they knew what differēce there was betwixt οὐσία & σῶμα substance & body : if they had so meant,they wanted not wordes to haue expressed their meaning.

Camp. They might thinke they had certaine subtill bodyes, according to the formes that they did take, as Augustine & some other haue held:besides,this was not an error of faith.

Fulke. Ergo it was of maners,belike.

Camp. It was a small error,neither of faith nor maners.

Fulke. I proue it was an error of faith. We beleeue that God is the creator of all things visible and inuisible:but if Angels and

ſpirits be viſible, then are there no inuiſible thinges, whereof we beleeue God to be the creator. Beſides, they doe not only make them viſible, but circumſcriptible alſo: and therefore they doe meane bodyes, and not ſubſtances generally: for onely bodyes, are circumſcriptible.

Camp. They meane not ſuch bodyes as we haue, but ſuch as they tooke: howe could they els be painted?

Fulk. But they (ſay they) were viſible and circumſcriptible.

Campion. Becauſe they do *Aſſumere corpora*, not becauſe they had bodies in deede, but ſeemed to haue.

Fulk. But the Coũcill ſaith, they haue proper bodyes of their own, & are circũſcriptible, & haue bin ſeene in their proper bodies

Campion. It was no decree.

Fulke. *Sacra Synodus dixit, Etiam domine*: All the holy Synode confirmed it, ſaying, Euen ſo my Lord.

Campion. Many a ſaint in heauẽ haue thought as hard matters as this, and they are ſaued.

Fulke. I deny not that, but yet this was an error of faith, neither doeth euery error in faith ſhut out a man from ſaluation.

Camp. In deede ſo you ſay in your booke againſt Briſtow, that the Church may erre in matters of faith, for you ſay that Inuocation of Saints, and prayer for the dead, were errors in faith, and yet that they which vſed them, are ſaued. I wonder therefore why you crye out ſo lowd in your pulpits againſt Inuocation of ſaintes, & haue nothing more in your mouthes then Blaſphemie, Blaſphemie, when the Catholikes mainetaine it.

Fulke. I ſay in deed, that Inuocation of ſaints, as it was held of ſome of the later ſort of ancient fathers, was an error in faith: but yet not ſuch as coulde exclude them from being members of the true Church, and yet the ſame error as it is vſed of Papiſtes, is blaſphemous. Theſe fathers helde the foundation Faith, and therefore that error was not damnable in them.

Campion. In deed you ſay, that if a man haue faith, what errors ſoeuer he haue beſides, it is well enough, ſo long as he holde your faith: it makes no matter what errors ſo euer he holde with it, he can not periſh.

Fulke. You ſlander my booke, I neuer witte ſo.

Camp. Let me ſee your booke, and I will ſhewe it you.

Fulke. In what booke will you ſhewe it?

Camp.

Campion. In your booke against Bristowe.

Fulke. You shall see the booke at our next meeting, and if you be able to shewe any such wordes, or matter either, I will lose my head. I may say, and haue said, that the Fathers had their errors, among which some allowed inuocation of Saintes, and yet holding the foundation, they may be saued.

Campion. Very wel, that is al one: why should you thē make so much a doe against inuocation of Saintes? Why doe you not say in your pulpits, that it is an indifferent matter?

Fulke. Because as you holde it, it is in deede a blasphemous errour: but as the Fathers helde it, it was no blasphemous error, but yet an errour, and no indifferent thing.

Goade. Are you ignorant that they which hold the foundation, though they erre in some particular poyntes of doctrine, they may be saued? Shall euery particular point of errour in doctrine depriue a man of saluation, holding soundly ỹ foundation Christ?

Campion. Well, hee sayeth it in his booke, &c. If a man haue onely faith, it maketh no matter what errours he holde beside.

Fulke. You shamefully slaunder my booke, and I knowe you can shewe no such thing out of my booke. Nowe you haue graunted so many absurdities, ye knowe not howe to make vp the matter, but by slaundering my booke.

Campion. I haue graunted no absurdities, but I will defend them, bring me the booke, and I will shewe it you. And thereupon I challenge you, you and I at Cambridge M. Doctor, to trie it.

Fulke. Very well Sir, you shew your selfe according to your publike challenge, more bold then wise: you that haue challenged all the Realme, no maruell if you challenge me.

Campion. I wil stand to my challenge, and here I challenge you to dispute with you at Cambridge, if you dare.

Fulke. It lieth not in mee to remoue you to Cambridge. I came hither vpon commandement at this time, otherwise you are not the man whom I would chuse & take for to be mine aduersarie, if you were at libertie. There are twentie of your side, whom I would rather take if I should chuse mine equal, which make no such challenge. *Non tibi plus cordis, sed minus oris ineſt.*

Goade. Your Church denyeth an article of fayth: Ergo it erreth, &c. 9. Argument.

Campion. God forbid, it doeth not.

Goade. You denie the bodily ascention of Christ into heauen: Ergo an article of faith.

Campion. We do not deny it.

Goade. You deny that he is bodily in heauen, for you say that he is bodily in earth: but he can not be both in heauen and earth at once, if he haue a true bodie.

Campion. I deny your argument. For he is, and may bee in many places at once, touching his body.

Goade. It is contrary to the nature of a true bodie, to bee in many places at once. For a true naturall body, must haue the properties of a very naturall and true body, and so you make Christ to haue a phantasticall and not a true body. You say, at the same time he is in earth, and in heauen. Saint Augustine, confuting the like errour of those that denied that Christ had a true body, sayth:

Ad Dard. Epist. 57. *Cauendum ne ita diuinitatem astruamus hominis, vt veritatem corporis auferamus.* We must beware that wee doe not so maintaine the diuinitie of Christ, that wee take away the true nature of a body. *Iesus Christus vbique est per id quod Deus est, in cœlo autem per id quod homo, &c.* Iesus Christ is present euery where, according to his Godhead, but he is in heauen according to his manhoode. And in Ioh. tractatu 3. *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit, vno tantum loco esse potest: veritas autem eius vbique diffusa est, &c.* The body of Christ wherein hee rose againe from the dead, can be onely in one place: but the trueth of Christ is spread euery where.

Campion. All this is true according to nature, but in the sacrament it is a miracle.

Goade. Augustine denieth any miracle to bee in the Sacraments: therefore you can not flee to miracle. The very wordes I nowe remember not, but I am sure I haue read it to that effect.

Fulke. His wordes are as I thinke, *Sacramenta honorem vt religiosa habere possunt, stuporem vt mira habere non possunt.* Our Sacraments may haue reuerence as things religious & holy, but they can not be wondered at, as things straunge & miraculous.

Goade. Peter saith Act. 3. Whome the heauens must holde till the restauration of all things.

Campion. What, will you make him a prisoner nowe in heauen:

uen: must he be bound to those properties of a natural body: Heauen is his palace, and you would make it his prison.

Goade. They are the wordes of the holy Ghost, Whom the heauens must conteine vntill, &c. It becommeth not you so to iest at them, and specially considering your state, being a prisoner: ye shoulde not so play with the worde of God. I see nowe, the modestie I heard reported to be in you, is cleane contrary. I woulde to God you would make more conscience in speaking more reuerently of such Diuine matters.

Campion. I am a prisoner for religion. But touching Christ his bodie, why I pray you, might not that same naturall bodie, which by nature being heauie, and yet ascended vpward steppe by steppe, and pearced those thicke Chrystall heauens which are harder then any chrystal, walked vpon the waters, and came thorowe the doore being shutte, why, may not the same body likewise be in many places at once: A fancie in philosophie.

Fulke. It were a hard matter for you to proove, that the heauens are harder then Chrystal.

Campion. I can proue it.

Goade. The text doeth not saye, that hee came thorowe the doores being shut, but hee came when the doores were shutte, the doores by his diuine power giuing place to his bodie, as the brasen gates in the Actes did vnto Peter of their owne accorde. Besides, these other thinges you speake of, they were extraordinarie workes, &c.

Camp. The text is plaine, that he came in by a great miracle.

Fulke. First, there is no worde in the text to enforce a miracle, notwithstanding I am content to graunt that he came in miraculously: which myght bee, eyther the doores opening of their owne accorde vnto him, as was saide they did vnto Peter, or by giuing place vnto his diuine power.

Camp. If he neither came thorowe the doores, nor wrought a miracle, howe came he in: Belike he played some iugling tricke.

Fulke. That is a vile blasphemie. It appeareth you haue great reuerence of Christ, that speake so blasphemously of him, and beare no more reuerence to his holy word. Here it appeared that many were offended with the indignitie thereof.

Campion. Why, what would you call it: if it were not a miracle, it must be some such thing.

Fulke,

Fulke. It might be a miracle, though he came not thorow the dooze, for he came after the doozes were shutte. Is it a necessarie consequence, to say, such a one came in after the doozes were shut: Ergo he came thorowe the doozes? What tempus is the verbe?

Camp. I thinke it be the Aoriste.

Fulke. The word is, κεκλεισμένον. I pray you what tempus is it?

Campion. The perfect tempus, euen as *clausis* the Latine worde is.

Fulke. But you did English it before, the doozes being shut, which is the present tempus.

Campion. You know it is the phrase of our English speach.

Fulke. Our English phrase will beare as wel, after ỹ doozes were shut.

Here Master Lieutenaunt shewed them the time was past, and so they left off.

William Fulke.
Roger Goade.

A remembrance of

the conference had in the tower with Edmund Campion Iesuite, by William Fulke and Roger Goade Doctors in Diuinitie, the 23. of September, 1581. as foloweth.

The assertions of Campion were these,

1, Christ is in the blessed Sacrament substantially, very God and very man, in his naturall body.

The 2, After the wordes of consecration, the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.

The questions

FIrst Master Lieutenaunt in a short and pithie speache, exhorted Campion to consider what great fauour her Maiestie shewed him, that hee might haue conference with the learned to reforme his errours, when they shoulde bee playnely conuinced out of the worde of God, &c.

Campion. I do acknowledge, that I am beholding to her Maiestie. If she haue appoynted this conference to instruct me, thinking me to be out of the way, I can not but be thankefull to her Maiestie for the same. Yet I protest (being resolute in my conscience) that I come not with my minde so suspended as to doubt of my cause, but my intent is to doe you good: as you would instruct me, so would I instruct you: as you would drawe me, so would I drawe you. Therefore, take my intent in good part, as I would do yours. I come to giue an accõpt of my faith, I am not vnresolute. This said, he crossed himselfe after his superstitious maner.

Fulke. Let vs begin with prayer. O eternall and most mercifull God, we humbly thanke thy Maiestie, that thou hast lightened our mindes with the knowledge of thy trueth: we heartily beseeche thee, to confirme & encrease our faith alwayes in the same,

and at this time graunt, that we may so defende thy trueth, that thou mayest haue the glory, the obstinate heretike may be confounded, the weake may be strengthened, & we al may be edified in Iesus Christ, through whome we make our prayers, and to whome with thee and the holy Ghost the Spirite of trueth, be all honour and glory, Amen.

We are earnestly moued, because of the confusion the other day, that it might be auoyded nowe, to desire that we might haue some Moderator, if we might intreate any of these learned men that are present to take the paynes: otherwise, that it might please Master Lieutenaunt when one argument is done, to commaunde vs to go to another. And also when we haue accepted an answere, not to suffer the aduersarie to carie the matter with multitude of wordes: so that we be neither forced to leaue our argument, as though we could followe it no longer, nor the aduersarie permitted with large discourses to spend the time vnprofitably, contrary to the right meaning of this conference.

Here M. Lieutenaunt was content, that any learned man present might moderate, but none would take it vpon them.

But before we enter into the matters appointed, wee haue to discharge our credite for the authoritie of the Fathers, whom we alleadged the last day in the afternoone when wee had not the bookes ready to shewe, because the question was then vpon the suddaine both chosen and disputed vpon, all within two houres: whereupon we promised to bring the bookes as this day, because the aduersarie would not credite our allegations written in our note bookes, some of them more then twentie yeeres agoe, not to deceiue the Papistes, but to helpe our owne memorie.

The first place that I haue to shewe, is out of Saint Augustine, *de Baptismo contra Donatistas. lib. 2. cap. 2. Quis autem nesciat, &c.* as before in the first dayes conference.

Camp. You might haue spared this labour, for of this place I did not doubt, my answere was, &c. *vt supra.*

Fulke. We haue your answere: let vs haue no repetition.

Campion. The greatest matter that was doubted of, was the decree of Innocentius cõcerning the communicating of infants, the second Councill of Nice, and the prayer at the latter ende of euery Councill. You must proue these three to be erronious.

Fulke. I haue proued them already: I am nowe onely to shew that the bookes thẽselues agree with my written notes. I would

haue

haue shewed you them all in order, though you had not put me in minde. The decree of Innocentius cited by Saint Augustine contra 2. epist. Pelag. ad Bonifacium lib. 2. cap. 4. *Hæc enim eius verba sunt, &c. vt supra.* These are the wordes of Innocentius, concerning the communicating of infants. S. Augustines wordes vpon the same are these. *Ecce beatæ memoriæ Innocentius, &c.* Behold Innocentius of blessed memorie, &c.

Campion. This is plaine, I will answere you.

Fulk. We haue your answere.

Campion. You read not so much afore.

Fulke. I haue read no more nowe then I did before out of my note booke.

Campion. Mine answere is, to deny that Innocentius maketh it necessary for infants to communicate.

Fulke. We haue your answere before, I come onely to discharge my credite for alleaging the booke truely.

Camp. Mine answere was, that it was neuer simply necessary, but necessary according to the practise of the Church.

Fulke. What neede these repetitions?

Camp. I must declare mine answere.

Fulke. We haue it already.

Campion. You come to appose me, as if I were a scholler in the Grammar schoole.

Fulke. You thinke by multitude of wordes to cary away the matter: but you shall haue no such scope, as you had the last daye.

Campion. You are very imperious. I trust, I answered you sufficiently the last day.

Fulke. The other day when wee had some hope of your conuersion, we forbare you much, and suffered you to discourse, contrary to the order of any good conference, whereupon it hath bene giuen out by some of your sect, that you had the best part, because you had the most wordes. And therefore, nowe that we see you are an obstinate heretike, and seeke to couer the light of the trueth with multitude of wordes, we meane not to allow you such large discourses, nor to forbeare you, as we did.

Campion. You are very imperious to day, whatsoeuer the matter is. My answer I am sure was sufficient, to any thing you

could bring, you neede not to be so imperious: I am the Queenes prisoner, and none of yours.

Fulke. Not a whit imperious, though I will exact of you to keepe the right order of disputation. What your answeres were the last day, it is well knowen to so many lawfull witnesses as were present: beside, they are registred out of your mouth: they were euen such as are like to proceede from a Fryer, full of impudencie and garrulitie.

Campion. Well, I must beare this at your hand, and much more. You charge me with multitude of wordes: may I not adde vnto my answere?

Fulke. We haue heard your answere before: we are not now to dispute the matter againe, but to deliuer our credite for the allegations.

Campion. Goe forwarde then.

Fulke. This was the second. Of the forme of prayer after the Councill, which is this: *Te in nostris principijs &c. vt errori indulgeas, &c.* We beseech thee in these our beginnings &c. that thou wilt pardon our errour. And againe, *Et quia conscientia remordente tabescimus, ne aut ignorantia nos traxerit in errorem, &c.* And because our owne consciences accusing vs, we doe faynt, least either ignorance hath drawen vs into errour, &c. As was alleadged in the first dayes conference.

Camp. Where you inferre, that the Councill asked forgiuenesse of their erronious decree: they meant not any errour of doctrine, but of wordes whatsoeuer had bene spoken against the decree, before the determination of the Councill: as, many wordes might be before vsed, which after the Councils determination, it was not lawfull to vse.

Fulke. They feare least ignorance might haue drawen them into error, or headlong will driuen them to decline from Iustice: & therefore they desired pardon, euen for their erronious & vniust determinatiõs, if any were: which were needeles, if none could be.

Camp. I say, they prayed for those that before the determination of the decree were in errour, or for those that spoke against the decree before it was concluded: as, when thinges are disputed of doubtfully, many things are spoken amisse: as, if any wordes be spoken here, to conuert an other. &c.

Goade You are full of similitudes, and as euill you applie them. It is well that you make no more account of generall Councils: for by your similitude, you make a generall Councill no better then this meeting.

Campion. I doe not make this and a generall Councill a like.

Fulke. The next place was cited out of the second Council of Nice, which decreeth that Angels and soules of mẽ, haue bodies, are visible, are circumscriptible. *Actione 5. Sanctus dixit de Angelis. &c.*

Campion. Let me haue the booke.

Fulke. You shall haue it when I haue read the place. *De Angelis & Archangelis & eorum potestatibus, quibus & nostras animas adiungo, ipsa Cathol. Ecclesia sentit, esse quidem intelligibiles sed non omnino corporis expertes & inuisibiles, vt vos Gentiles dicitis: verum tenui corpore preditos & aerio siue igneo, vt scriptum est, Qui facit Angelos suos spiritus, & ministros eius ignem vrentem: sic autem multos sanctorum patrum sensisse cognouimus. Quorũ est Basilius cognomento Magnus, & beatus Athanasius, & Methodius, & qui stant ab illis. Solummodo autẽ Deus incorporeus, & informabilis. Intelligibiles autem creaturæ nequaquam ex toto sunt incorporeæ & inimitabiles. Pictura existunt, quare etiã in loco existunt, & circumferentiam habent. Quanquam autem non sunt vt nos corporeæ, vtpote ex quatuor elementis, & crassa illa materia: nemo tamen vel Angelos, vel dæmones vel animas dixerit incorporeas. Multoties enĩ in proprio corpore visi sunt, sed ab illis, quibus dominus oculos aperuit, Nos igitur eos nõ vt Deũ, sed vt creaturas intelligibiles & ministros Dei, nõ tamẽ vt verè incorporeos, pingimus & colimus. Quod autẽ hominis formæ pingãtur in causa est, quod in ea visi sunt, si quãdo ministeriũ Dei apud homines obierint. Tharasius sanctiss. Patriarcha dixit, Animaduertamus dictũ patris, quod illic, Samaritæ imagines Domini & seruatoris nostri, item intemeratæ eius matris subuerterunt: hic vero, Gentiles. Ostendit autem pater quod & Angelos pingere oportet quando circumscribi possint, & vt homines apparuerint. Sacra Synodus dixit, Etiam domine.* Concerning Angels and Archangels, and the powers of them, vnto whom also I adioyne our soules, the Catholike Church her selfe doeth so thinke, that they are in deede intelligible, but not altogether

voyde of bodies and inuisible, as you Gentiles do say: but that they haue a thinne bodie, either of ayre or of fyre, as it is written, Which maketh his Angels spirites, and his ministers a burning fire. And so we haue knowen that many of the holy fathers haue thought, among whome is Basill, surnamed the great, and blessed Athanasius and Methodius, and them that stande with them, Onely God is without body and shape: but the intelligible creatures are not altogether bodiles, and they are such as may be portraicted in picture. Wherefore they are in place also, and haue a circumscription although they be not bodily as we are, as of the foure elementes, and that grosse matter. Yet no man may say that Angels, or deuils, or soules are without bodies, for they haue bene often seene in their proper bodies: but of them, to whome the Lord hath opened their eyes. Therefore we do paint and worship them, not as God, but as intelligible creatures and the ministers of God, but yet not as truely being without body. But that they are painted in the shape of man, the cause is, that they haue bene seen in that shape, if at any time they did execute the ministerie of God amõgst mẽ. Tharasius the most holy Patriarch saide, Let vs marke the saying of the father: that there, the Samaritans did ouerthrowe the images of our Lord and sauiour, and also of his vndefiled mother: but here, the Gentiles. The father also sheweth, that wee ought to paint the Angels, seeing they may be circumscribed, and haue appeared as men. The holy Synode said, Yea, my Lord.

Camp. You haue answered your selfe.

Fulke. That is your common answere, when you can coyne no better.

Camp. I answered then, and so do nowe: *Assumunt corpora*, They take bodies vpon them, they haue none of their owne.

Fulke. He sayth, they may be circumscribed.

Camp. That is, they may be painted.

Fulke. Nay, he saith plainely, they are not *Expertes corporis*, voyde of bodie, and defineth of what bodily matter they consist, namely of ayre or fire, and for that he alledgeth the scripture: also he saith, they are not inuisible.

Campion. Looke in what bodies they haue appeared, in such they may be painted: they did appeare as men, they bee not men,

neither

neither haue they bodies of their owne.

Fulke. He sayth expressely, they haue bene seene in their owne proper body.

Campion. The iudgement of the Councill is, that the Angels may be painted: that is all.

Fulke. That is not all: for it affirmeth that they are circumscriptible and visible, as I said before.

Campion. You haue proued no error of the Councill.

Fulke. We might haue brought the Epitome of the Councils, gathered by one Bartholomew Caranza, a Spanish Fryer, which noteth it for an error in that Councill, contrary to the Lateran Councill vnder Innocentius the thirde, who thought him selfe as well learned as you.

Camp. It is no matter.

Fulke. Yes, it is a matter when Papistes agree not amongst themselues.

Camp. You should haue brought it, I would haue answered him also.

Fulke. Well, let them that bee wise and learned, peruse the Councill at their leasure. Further, in reasoning of Peters reprehension, you said his error was a matter of fact, and not of fayth: for the Pope you say may so erre, and bee reprehended of a poore Priest, who may say vnto him: Sir, why do you so? To this I replied that so to reprehend the Pope, was against your owne Canon law, which now I proue out of the decrees. *Parte 1. Distinct. 40. cap. Si Papa suæ & fraternæ salutis negligẽs deprehenditur, inutilis & remissus in suis operibus, & insuper à bono tacitumus, quod magis officit sibi & omnibus: nihilominus innumerabiles populos cateruatim secum ducit primo mancipio gehennæ, cum ipso plagis multis in æternũ vapulaturus. Huius culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus, qui cunctos ipse iudicaturus à nemine est iudicandus, nisi deprehendatur à fide deuius. Pro cuius perpetuo statu, vniuersitas fidelium tanto instantius orat, quanto suam salutem post Deum, ex illius incolumitate animaduertit propensius pendere.* If the Pope be found negligent of his owne and his brethrens saluation, vnprofitable and remisse in his workes, and also holding his peace of goodnesse, which doeth more hurt him and all men: neuertheles, he leadeth with him innumerable people by heapes, to the chiefe

chiefe slaue of hell, with whome hee shall be beaten with many stripes for euer. No mortal man doeth here presume to reproue his faultes, because he himselfe being to iudge all men, is to bee iudged of no man, except he be founde erring from the faith: for whose perpetuall state, the vniuersitie of faithfull doeth pray so much the more earnestly, by howe much it perceiueth their saluation after God to hang more readily of his health. Againe, by the Extrauagant, *De concessione prebendæ titulo. 4. cap. 2. ad Apostolatus*, in the Glosse, where hee sheweth that the Pope may doe that which to all others is forbidden. *Nec est qui audeat dicere, Domine cur ita facis?* And in the marginall note: *Papæ nullus audeat dicere, Domine, cur ita facis?* No man may be bold to say to the Pope, Sir, why do you so?

Camp. Reade the decree againe.

Fulke. *Si Papa, &c.*

Campion. The meaning of the decree is, that no man may iudicially reprehend him: I say so.

Fulke. Both the decree & the Extrauagant, speake generally, that the Pope must not be reprehended of any man, except he be an heretike, whereof it followeth, that Gratians Decree and the Glosse thought not, but that he might erre in faith.

Camp. Mine answere is, he may do it soberly, as a man may with humilitie reprehend his prince, but not iudge him.

Fulke. Let other men iudge, I haue shewed as much as I promised out of the Canon Law. You charged me to affirme in mine answer to Brislow, that so a man holde the foundation of faith, it is no matter what errors he holde beside. Here is my booke, shew these wordes, or any wordes to that sense, as you promised.

Camp. You say that the true Church may erre in matters of great weight, so they retaine the foundation.

Fulke. I say, ỳ so long as a man holdeth the foundation, though he erre in small matters, he may be saued.

Cam. You say ỳ fathers erred in inuocation of Saints, which is a great matter with Gods Church, though you call it a small matter, & yet you will not teach the people ỳ it is a small matter.

Fulke. I saie, that inuocation of Saints as it was held by some of the latter sort of auncient fathers, was but a smal error in comparison of such grosse heresies which the Popish Church doeth now holde, and in comparison of such inuocation of Saints as is

now

now mainteined and practised by the Papistes: but your accusatiõ of my booke was written, therefore you can not alter it.

Camp. Lend me your booke, that I may charge you. The booke being deliuered, after a litle turning, he sayde, This is not the booke that I meant.

Fulke. This is the booke that you named.

Camp. I meant your answere vnto Doctor Allens articles, because Bristow hath confuted it.

Fulk. This is a poore shift, whẽ you haue slandered my booke, and named one, to flie to another: so would you do with that booke you name now. For I am sure, that neither in that, nor any other that euer I wrote, your slander can be founde.

Goad. There is an other thing ye were desirous to see, touching the Councill of Canstantinople, and the Councill of Nice, one of them being alleaged to be cõtrary to the other about setting vp of Images in the Church: the Councill of Constantinople disalowing Images, and the second Councill of Nice allowing them, and condemning the other Councill as erroneous.

Camp. That of Constantinople, was not a generall nor lawfull Councill, but a certaine Iconomachy, and may rather be called a conuenticle then a generall Councill, and therefore no contrarietie hereby proued betweene generall Councils.

Goade. It appeareth it was generall, and solemnely gathered in the chiefe citie. Heare the wordes in the title of the Councill: *Sancta, magna & vniuersalis Synodus quæ iuxta gratiã Dei, & per pium deuotorum & orthodoxorum nostrorum Imperatorum Constãtini & Leonis decretum, in hac diuinorum studiosa & regia ciuitate congregata est, &c.* The holy, great and vniuersall Synode which by the grace of God and the godly decree of our godly Emperours Constantine and Leo, is gathered in this holy and royall citie. This Councill did confute by the Scriptures, the setting vp of Images in ỹ Church, out of Deut. 20. Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any Image nor likenes of any thing, &c. and Deut. 4. For which cause (saieth this Councill) you heard the voyce of wordes in the middest of the fire, but you sawe no image. Contrary to this, the Councill of Nice doth accurse those that will not worship images, in these wordes: *Qui venerandas imagines non venerãtur, Anathema.* Accursed be they ỹ worship not holy images. Conc. To. 3. fol. 139.

So it appeareth that these two Councils were contrary, and

therefore one of them did erre. But I will proceede to the next place. You doubted also, whether it were to be founde in Saint Augustine, that there is no Miracle in the Sacrament. Now you may heare his owne wordes. *To.3. De Trinitate lib.3.cap.10. Sicut panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo Sacramento consumitur. Sed quia hæc hominibus nota sunt quia per homines fiunt, honorem tanquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tanquam mira non possunt.* As the bread ordained for this purpose, is consumed in receauing the Sacrament. But because these things are knowen vnto men, & are done by men, they may haue honour or reuerence as holy things, but they can not be wondered at as things strange and miraculous. Here you haue Augustines words against miracle in the Sacrament.

Camp. In deede there is no such euident miracle visibly appearing, as when Christ cured ỹ lame, the blinde, &c. but yet there is a great miracle which our faith doeth acknowledge.

Goade. Augustine speaketh simply against miracle: so that whether it be visible or inuisible, both is excluded. Beside, it is perpetuall in all miracles, that there must be some outward sensible signe. Further, you doubted of *Inhærens iustitia*, righteousnes inherent in our selues, which I auouched to bee erroneous doctrine set forth in the late Councel of Trent. The wordes are these, *Concil. Trident. cap.7. Verè iusti nominamur, & sumus iustitiam in nobis recipientes vnusquisq; suam, secundum mensuram quam spiritus sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, secundum propriam cuiusque dispositionem & cooperationem. Et cap.16. Quæ quum iustitia nostra dicitur, quia per eam nobis inhærentem iustificamur, illa eadem Dei est, quia a Deo nobis infunditur per Christi meritum.* We are called and in deede are truely righteous, receiuing in our selues euery man his own righteousnes, according to the measure which the holy Ghost doth deuide to euery one euen as he wil, according to euery mans own proper disposition & cooperation. For that righteousnes which is called ours, because we are iustified by it inherent in our selues, the selfe same is the righteousnes of God, because it is powred into vs from God by the merit of Christ.

Camp. I did not doubt of inherent righteousnes in our selues, whether it were in ỹ Councill of Trent, for I defend & maintaine it as the Councill teacheth it: you saye it is by imputation of

Christes

Christes righteousnes being without vs, whereby wee are iustified: and I say, we are iustified by that righteousnesse which is within vs, though it be not of vs.

Goade. The place which I vrged against you the other day, beside many other in ỹ scripture, is directly against this doctrine. 2. Cor. 5. 21. He hath made him to be sin for vs which knewe no sinne, that we should be made the righteousnes of God in him.

Fulke. Well, nowe we are to come to the question. You holde, that the natural body & blood of Christ is contained in the Sacrament of the Lordes supper. Your wordes are, Christ is present in the Sacrament substãtially, very God & man, in his natural body.

Camp. I say, there is really present in the Sacrament, the naturall body and blood of Christ vnder that bread and cup.

Fulke. What meane you by these wordes vnder the bread and cup, that we may agree of termes?

Camp. You knowe in the bread is whitenes, &c. that is not in his body. Make your argument.

Fulke. So I will.

The cup is not the naturall blood of Christ: Argu. 1.

Ergo the other parte is not his naturall body.

Campion. There is present in the cup, the naturall blood of Christ. Go to my wordes.

Fulke. Well.

The naturall blood of Christ is not present in the cup:

Ergo the naturall body is not present in the other part.

Camp. The naturall blood of Christ is present in the cup.

Fulke. Thus I disproue it.

The wordes of Christes institution be these,

This cup is the new testament in my blood:

But the naturall blood of Christ is not the newe testament in his blood:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not in the cup.

Camp. The word, Is, is neither in ỹ Hebrew, nor in ỹ Greeke.

Fulke. Very well, you shall see me finde it. τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

Campion. You must adde this worde ἐστὶ.

Fulke. Nay, the worde ἐστὶ is in Saint Paul: This cup is the newe testament in my blood.

Campion. The worde est, which is vnderstoode, is referred to the beginning of the sentence. *Hic est calix nouum testamentum in sanguine meo:* This is the cup, the new testament in my blood: he saith not, this cup is the new testament.

Fulke. You peruert the wordes, you cannot shift it off so.

Campion. My text hath it so.

Fulke. It can not be so, you haue heard the Greeke, and your vulgar translation is according to the Greeke: *Hic calix nouum testamentum est in meo sanguine. 1. Cor. cap. 11.*

Camp. No Syr, I was in hande with the 22. of Luke.

Fulke. Shall you appoint me my text? I say, my text is taken out of Saint Paul. I haue shewed est in the Greeke & Latin both.

Campion. It is referred to the beginning, *Hic est calix nouum testamentum.*

Fulke. The composition cannot admitte that peruersion, you would obscure the sense by disordering the wordes: but Saint Paul is a better interpreter of Saint Luke, in whom the verbe est lacketh, then your vulgar translation.

Campion. What do you inferre of these wordes?

Fulke. The cup is the newe testament:

But the naturall blood of Christ is not the newe testament:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not the cup.

Camp. M. Doctor this is your argument. The cup is the new testament, &c. I deny your argument.

Fulke. It is a syllogisme.

Campion. It is neither in mode, nor figure.

Fulke. It is in Baroco.

Camp. You take the cup otherwise in ꝑ Maior then in ꝑ conclusion. For when it is said, the cuppe is the new Testament, the meaning is, that in the cuppe, which is the blood of Christ, is the couenant of the newe Testament. In the conclusion you take the cuppe for the chalice, wherein the blood of Christ is.

Fulke. I take the cup for the same, in both. I speake & meane as the Apostle doeth. I take the cuppe for that which is in the cuppe: Therefore marke my argument againe.

The cup, or that which is in the cuppe, is the new Testament:

The naturall blood of Christ is not the newe Testament:

Ergo the naturall blood of Christ is not the cup, or that which

is in

is in the cuppe. Answere to this Syllogisme.

Campion. It is no Syllogisme, there be *quatuor termini.*

Fulke. Well, I perceiue then, you can answere no otherwise.

Campion. It is plaine taking the cup, for that in the cuppe.

Fulke. Master Lieutenant, you heare his answere. I will rest in the iudgement of those which know what a Syllogisme is.

Goade. I will propounde an other argument. You say that Christ is present in the Sacrament substantially, very God and man in his naturall bodie, which I improue thus.

Looke howe Christ was present to the Fathers in the wilder- 2. Argumẽt
nesse in Manna, and in the rocke, euen so he is present to vs in our Sacrament:

But he was not present to them in their Sacrament in his naturall bodie:

Therefore he is not in his naturall bodie present in our Sacrament.

Camp. I denie your Maior or first proposition.

Goade. I proue it thus. They receiued in their Sacrament the same substance that wee doe: Therefore they had the same presence.

Campion. I denie your Antecedent.

Goade. I prooue it out of the plaine wordes of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 10. 3. *Et omnes eandem escam, &c.* speaking of our fathers the Israelites, he sayth, And did al eate the same spiritual meate, and did all drinke the same spirituall drinke: for they dranke of the spirituall rocke that followed them, & the rocke was Christ.

Campion. They did eate *eandem escam spiritualem*, the same spirituall grace, but not the same substance.

Goade. They receiued the same that we doe touching the substance: you cannot so auoyde the force of this place. Spirituall is added in respect of the corporal signes, which differ betwene them and vs, as shall after appeare, but the same spirituall substance in both, as the circumstance of that place enforceth.

Camp. Why, Christ had yet receiued no substance of flesh, and therefore could not then bee present to them substantially in his naturall bodie.

Goade. You reason well for mee. Therefore he was present vnto them spiritually, as the wordes are, *eandem escam spiritua-*

lem: And so he is to vs present, and not carnally, because Christ had not then taken flesh, and the Fathers did then eate Christ in substance as well as we, therefore the presence and eating in both, must needes be spirituall.

Camp. I answere they had the same in a mysterie and figure.

Goade. This is no answere. I will easily take it away both by the wordes following in the text, and also by the manifest circumstance of the place, both which proueth to be clerely the same in substance. They had the same Christ, who is the substance of our Sacraments: ergo the same substance that we haue.

Camp. They had not the same Christ in substance, in their Sacrament.

Goade. The words following are plaine to expoũd the Apostles meaning: *Et omnes eundem potum biberunt, &c. Petra autem erat Christus.* They did all drinke the same spirituall drinke, for they drunke of the spirituall rocke that followed them, which rocke was Christ: Therefore they eating and drinking the same Christ, did eate and drinke the same substance.

Campion. There is a fallation in the worde, *eandem*, the same. In a mystery and in signification the same, but in substance great difference.

Goade. The difference was onely in the outward signes, the measure of reuelation, and in time, they beleeuing on Christ to come, and we in Christ that is come: but in matter and substance the very same. And that the Apostles meaning must needes be so, I will now manifestly proue out of the circumstance of this text, and out of the Apostles owne argument. His purpose is to proue that the Israelites were nothing inferior to the Corinthians, touching the seales or Sacramentes of Gods fauour: and therefore the Corinthians had no more to boaste in touching their Sacramentes, then the Israelites had. Whereupon he sayeth they did eate the same meate &c. ergo they were equall. Nowe if they eate not the same in substance, which the Corinthians did eate, but only in shadow & figure (as you say) then the Israelites were much inferior to the Corinthians in their sacraments, and so ye would make the Apostles argument of no force.

Campion. The Apostles meaning is, that the old Israelites

beleeued

beleeued in the same Christ, and did eate him after a sort, as wee doe: they were not altogether equall, for he speaketh a litle before of Baptisme, saying, that they were baptized in the cloude, this was not the same with our baptisme.

Goade. In deede the outward signe differed, as I said before: namely, the watrie cloude from our water in Baptisme, but in matter and substance it was a signe of the same inuisible grace. And so the Apostle proueth the Israelites equall to the Corinthians, and consequently to vs in both the sacraments.

Campion. Abraham beleeued in the same Christ, yet Christ was not then incarnate to Abraham, as he is now to vs, &c.

Goade. To what purpose is this? What doeth it helpe you? doeth it not rather confirme that I said to be true, the same in substance, the same Christ before & nowe, the difference to be in time? These are your olde excursions, when you can not answere the argument. But now, after I haue proued the same substance (which you denied) first by the plaine wordes, & then by the euident circumstance and drift of the text, I will yet further vrge this argument by the iudgement of Saint Augustine. tom. 9. in Ioh. tract. 26. *Sacramenta illa fuerunt in signis diuersa, sed in re quæ significatur, paria sunt. Apostolum audi. Omnes eandem escam spiritualem manducauerunt, spiritualem vtique eandem: Nam corporalem alteram, quia illi Manna, nos aliud: spiritualem verò quam nos.* Those Sacraments were in signes diuers, but in the thing signified are equall. Heare what the Apostle sayeth. All did eate the same spirituall meate: in deede the same meate spirituall. For touching the corporall meate they did eate one, & we another, but they did eate the same spirituall meate that we doe.

Camp. You must proue out of Augustine, that they did eate the same Christ.

Goade. That hath bene alreadie plainely prooued out of the text, They dranke of the rocke, &c. the rocke was Christ. But you shall haue it proued also out of Augustine, who expounding the Apostles wordes, sayth, they did eate the same spirituall meate that we do eate.

Camp. He meaneth, the same in effect.

Goade. Augustines wordes are plaine, not the same in effect, but in substance and matter. *In signis diuersa, sed in re paria.* Those

Sacraments

Sacraments in matter or thing ſignified are equall: He maketh difference in the ſignes, but none at all in the thing. *Re paria*: the ſame thing or ſubſtance in both, therefore the ſame Chriſt.

Campion. The ſame Chriſt was to them incarnate in hope and effect, as the Lambe is ſaid to be ſlaine from the beginning of the world: but Chriſt in deede was not yet incarnate.

Goade. True it is, that touching the purpoſe and counſaile of God, and the efficacie of Chriſtes death in all ages, the Lambe Chriſt was ſlaine from the beginning. But what is this to mine argument out of Auguſtine? The difference of time is no matter, they eate the ſame thing, they did eate *Sacramenta re paria*, ſayth Auguſtine. And in his treatiſe de vtilitate pœnitentiæ, Tom. 9. he proueth verie plainly, the ſame Chriſt and the ſame ſubſtance to be in the Iſraelites ſacrament, and in ours.

Campion. Reade the place.

Goade *Eundem inquit cibum ſpiritualem manducauerunt: quid eſt eundē, niſi quia eum quem etiam nos? Suffecerat vt diceret, cibum ſpiritualem manducauerunt: eundem inquit: eundem non inuenio quomodo intelligam, niſi eum quem manducamus & nos. Quid ergo ait aliquis, Hoc erat Manna illud, quod ego nunc accipio: Ergo nihil modo venit, ſi ante iam fuit: ergo euacuatum eſt ſcandalum crucis. Quomodo ergo eundem, niſi quia addidit ſpiritualem? Nam qui Manna illud ſic acceperunt, vt tantummodo indigentiæ ſuæ corporali ſatisfieri putarent, & ventrem ſuum paſci, nō mentem: nihil magnum manducauerunt. Quicunq; in Manna Chriſtum intellexerunt, eundem quem nos cibum ſpiritualem manducauerunt. Sic etiam eundem potum quem nos, ſed ſpiritualem, id eſt, qui fide capiebatur, non qui corpore hauriebatur. Audiſti eundem potum, petra erat Chriſtus. Non enim alter Chriſtus tunc, alter nunc. Tunc enim Chriſtus venturus, modo Chriſtus venit. Venturus & venit, diuerſa verba ſunt, ſed idem Chriſtus.* He ſayth they did eate the ſame ſpiritual meate. What is the ſame, but the ſame that we alſo eate? It might haue ſufficed to ſaye, they did eate ſpirituall meate, but he ſayth, the ſame. I do not find how to vnderſtand this worde, the ſame, but the ſame which we alſo do eate. Then may ſome ſay, What, was Manna the ſame which I nowe receiue? then doth nothing come now, but that which was before?

Some of theſe wordes were then omitted, & not read for breuitie ſake.

then

then the offence of the crosse is become voide: howe then can it be true that he sayeth, the same, but that he addeth spirituall? For they that did receiue Manna in such sort, that they thought thereby to satisfie onely their corporall necessitie, and to feede their belly and not their minde, did eate no great thing. Whosoeuer in Manna did vnderstand Christ, did eate the same spirituall meate that we doe, and also receiued the same drinke that we doe, but spirituall, that is, which was receiued by faith, and not by the body. Thou hast heard that it is the same drinke, the rocke was Christ. For there was not one Christ then, and another nowe: for then Christ was to come, nowe he is come. To come, and is come, be diuers wordes, but the same Christ. Yout heare howe Augustine, as it were of purpose, often vrgeth the worde, *eundem*, the same meate. And afterwarde explaneth it to be the same Christ in their Sacraments and ours, and notwithstanding the difference in time, yet the same in substance.

Campion. I graunt to be the same Christ, as I sayde before, touching the effect and deede, slaine to them in hope, but to vs in deede: they had the same touching the fruite and effect, and so S. Augustine is to be vnderstoode.

Goade. Your answere is more absurde then some other writers of your side. For they distinguish, though very corruptly, *Sacramenta veterum sub lege tantum figurabant, nostra autem conferunt gratiam.* The Sacraments of the fathers vnder the lawe did onely figure, but ours do conferre and giue grace.

Campion. This is mine answere: the same in effect and end, touching saluation. If you can say no more, ye may go to another argument.

Goade. Your answere is taken away, and can stand neither with the text of the Apostle, nor yet with Saint Augustines iudgement. Beside, it is manifest you woulde confound those things, which of their owne nature must needes be distinguished, namely the thing it selfe, and the effect, end, or fruite that commeth thereof. For the effect being saluation, is the fruite that followeth the spirituall eating of Christ being the thing it selfe or substance: whom whosoeuer first eateth not, can not be partaker of the fruite that followeth.

Camp. You haue not, neither can take away mine answere.

The same I say still, in effect & end, but not equal in the thing signified. As, a man may be sicke to day, and to morowe whole: the same man, but not the same in substance of his body and blood.

Goade. Well, seeing you haue none other answere, I will leaue this argument, and commit it to the iudgement of the learned to iudge of your answere.

Fulke. Thus I wil proue, that Christ is not present in his naturall body in the Sacrament.

3. Argument. Whatsoeuer is in the sacrament, is void of sense, or insensible:
But Christ is not insensible:
Ergo Christ is not in the Sacrament.

Camp. Your maior and your minor are both vntrue in some sense.

Fulke. This is your olde shift, to trouble the hearers vnderstanding, with proofe of both partes, that you might not be espied in the point of controuersie.

Campion. That you say vnsensible, it is true, if you meane the spirituall grace, which is not subiect to sense.

Fulke. I meane by insensible, voyde of life or sense.

Campion. Then I deny your maior.

Fulke. I proue it out of Epiphanius. lib. Anchorato.

Campion. Reade the place.

Fulke. The woordes be these. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἔλαβεν ὁ σωτὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ἄρτον, ὡς ἔχει ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὅτι αἴνεσιν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ, καὶ ἔκλασε τοῦτο. καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα. καὶ ὁρῶμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἴσον ἐστὶν, οὐδὲ ὅμοιον, τὸ τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ σαρκὶ εἰκόνι, οὐ τῇ ἀοράτῳ θεότητι, οὐ τοῖς χαρακτῆρσι τῶν μελῶν. τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστι στρογγυλοειδὲς καὶ κινεῖσθαι, εἰς πρὸς τὰ δύναμιν. καὶ ἠθέλησεν χάριτι εἰπεῖν, τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ σῶμα, καὶ οὐθεὶς ἀπιστεῖ, &c.

Campion. What woorde builde you vpon?

Fulke. I haue read the woordes, where he saith it is insensible, if you vnderstand it.

Campion. You might haue brought the Latine booke.

Fulke. Then you would haue cauiled, that it was not rightly translated: but you were best confesse your ignorance.

Campion. I pray you helpe me.

Fulke. If you vnderstand it your selfe, I neede not.

Campion. I vnderstande Latine better then Greeke. Yet I trust I haue Greeke ynough to answere you withall. Reade it in Latine.

Fulke.

Fulke. May, I will reade it in English, that other men may vnderstand it as well as you. For we see what our father tooke in his handes, as it is contained in the Gospel, that he arose at supper, and tooke these things. And after he had giuen thankes, he sayd, This of me is that. And we see that it is not equall, nor like, neither to the incarnate image, nor to the inuisible deitie, nor to the lineaments of his members: For this thing is of long shape, or rowle fashion, and voyde of sense, as concerning power. And yet he would say through grace, This of mine is that, and no man doeth discredit the saying.

Camp. You lose time: we should not credit our eyes, but faith. What haue you gotten by this place? Epiphanius saith none must discredit the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, because it is a long white thing.

Fulke. You vnderstand not the place.

Campion. The meaning is, we must not credite sense, but faith: you haue gained nothing by this place.

Fulke. Yes, more then you would willingly afford. First, that the sacramentall bread in ỹ time, was not such a round thin cake, as you vse in your Masse, but a rowle of bread: Secondly, that the sacrament was not equal wᵗʰ Christ: and thirdly, that it was an insensible thing, void of life, hauing not so much as ỹ power of sense.

Campion. He sayeth that we should not credit our sight, but faith: we must beleeue Christ to be present.

Fulke. As Christ hath sayd and meaneth.

Campion. That which I see is voyde of sense, it is against your selfe, it teacheth vs to beleeue faith.

Fulke. You know not ỹ argument of the booke, nor of ỹ place.

Campion. Yes, as well as you.

Fulke. Then shewe it afore this companie, you that will challenge the whole Church of England, and make profession of vniuersall knowledge.

Camp. I will answere any challenge I haue made.

Fulke. Yea, euen as you doe this. Shewe vs the argument which the Doctor handleth in this place, if you can.

Campion. I haue sayd, you are not able to replie.

Fulke Yes if you will shewe the argument, I will replie.

Campion. You doe not.

Fulke. I doe not, therefore I cannot? I wil first shew the argument of the place: he speaketh of images, and namely sheweth how man is made after Gods image, and yet is not equall with God, although Christ being the image of the Father, is equall with him. This he sheweth by example of the Sacrament, which is the image of Christ, in such sort as man is the image of God. For it is not equall with Christ, nor like vnto him, either concerning his humanitie or deitie: but a mere insensible thing, as that which hath no power of life: whereas Christ is all sensible, all of power, all incomprehensible, concerning his Godhead.

Campion. Replie against mine answere, if you can. The exterior forme or colour which we see, is that which he sayth to be insensible.

Fulke. He speaketh not of colour, he speaketh of that which Christ calleth his body. Is the exterior forme called the body of Christ? Is the colour of bread the image of Christ? Epiphanius sayeth, that of which Christ sayde, This is my body, is voyde of sense: Therefore he sayth the whole Sacrament, or whatsoeuer is contained in it, is insensible.

Campion. That is, Christ is not seene, but vnder the exterior forme or colour. For no substãce cã be seene. Are not you Doctor Fulke? and yet I see nothing but your colour and exterior forme. I wil abide by this, that ỹ substance of any thing can not be seene.

Fulke. I wil not vouchsafe to replie vpon this answere, too childish for a Sophister.

Camp. You are very imperious. You come I trowe, to pose me as a Grammer scholer, and to take me vp with checke at your pleasure. I know no cause why I should take it at your handes: I am the Queenes prisoner, and not yours.

Fulke. I would you were the Queenes true subiect.

4. Argument. Goade. Whatsoeuer is naturally present in the Sacrament, is beneath vpon earth:

But Christ touching his body is not beneath vpon earth:

Ergo Christ touching his body, is not naturally present in the Sacrament.

Campion. I deny your minor.

Goade. Christ touching his bodily presence is in heauen, and onely in heauen: therefore not vpon earth.

Campion.

Campion. I deny your Antecedent, it is partly true, & partly false, ordinarily he is in heauen, but miraculously his body also is in earth.

Goade. I will ease you of your distinction.

Christ is no way present on earth, touching his body:

Therefore neither ordinarily, nor yet miraculously. Answere to the argument briefly.

Campion. As briefe as you will. He is some way present vpon earth touching his body. Proue your antecedent.

Goade. I proue it thus.

If Christ touching his bodily presence, be any way present vpon earth, then he is to be sought vpon earth:

But he is not to be sought vpon earth:

Ergo no way present vpon earth.

Campion. I denie your Minor. He is some way to be sought vpon earth in the Sacrament, but not by his ordinarie presence.

Goade. Mine argument is against all distinction.

Campion. Will you not giue me leaue to distinguish?

Goade. I say, he is no way bodily present on earth, which vterly taketh away your distinction. And I proue it by ỹ Apostles reason, Colos. 3. 1. *Si consurrexistis cum Christo, &c.* If ye be risen together with Christ, seeke those things that are aboue where Christ sitteth at the right hande of God, set your affection on heauenly things, and not vpon earthly things. The Apostle exhorteth vs to seeke things aboue, because Christ is in heauen touching his body, sitting at the right hand of God. If he be beneath on earth bodily any way, then the Apostles reason is nothing.

Campion. The Apostles meaning is, that Christ is not to be sought for nowe, in that sort as when he walked vpon earth.

Goade. This answere is taken away before. The Apostles true meaning is, to drawe them from mens traditions, and earthly ceremonies, by this reason, Because Christ is not beneath on earth touching his body.

Campion. He meaneth of all earthly things, and not of ceremonies.

Goade. That is but your coniecture, of ignorance or forgetfulnes of the Apostles argument in the former chapter next going before.

Camp. Is not Christ to be sought vpon earth? when I looke into my Bible, doe I not seeke Christ?

Goade. I thinke you doe not truely seeke him.

Camp. Doe you?

Goade. I will not answere your wordes. Answere you mine argument, ye would go from the matter.

Camp. Your argument is nothing. If Christ be in heauen, I must not seeke him in earth.

Goade. It is the argument of the Apostle, and may thus be framed.

Our affection must there be set where Christ is, touching his body:

But Christ is in heauen alone touching his body, where he sitteth at the right hand of God:

Therefore our affection must be in heauen.

Camp. What is it to seeke Christ aboue? must I flie vp into heauen? it is our affection and cogitation that must be lift vp.

Goade. What is this to the argument, you answere not the Apostles reason, being framed into a Syllogisme.

Our affection must be where Christ is, touching his body:

But he is in heauen in his body, at the right hand of God:

Ergo there to be sought, and not vpon earth.

If Christ be any way vpon earth, the Apostles argument holdeth not: but contrariwise by the Apostles reason, earthly things were to be sought, if Christ be any way vpon earth touching his body.

Camp. I must not now seeke Christ in conuersation in Ierusalem: to seeke him in ỹ Sacrament, is not to seeke him in earth.

Goad. But if he be on earth in the Sacrament (as you say) bodily, then he may be sought vpon earth, yea and earthly things also, which the Apostle denieth. There is a manifest opposition in the Apostles wordes betweene aboue and beneath, in heauen and in earth: ye may not confound these.

We must ascende thether where Christ is:

But he is aboue in heauen:

Therefore in minde we must ascende into heauen.

Campion. The drift of the Apostle is, we must ascende with Christ, we must die with Christ, in affection, and spiritually.

Goad.

Goade. You neuer answere directly to the argument. It is contrary to the Apostles plaine wordes, and against the scope of his exhortation, that we shoulde seeke Christ beneath, as any way bodily present on earth.

Camp. Mine answere is, that according to his ordinarie presence he is aboue, but according to miracle, he is bodily vpon earth beneath.

Goade. Now ye flie againe to miracle: but this shift is taken away before. For if Christ bee any way bodily present on earth, though it be by miracle, then he is to be sought on earth, which the Apostle denieth. You heare his answere, this stone hath beene rowled enough.

Fulke. If Christ be present in his naturall body, he is present in his true body: 5. Argumens.

But he is not present in his true body:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall.

Campion. I deny your Minor: he is present in his true body.

Fulke. If he be present in his true body, then whersoeuer the Sacrament is, there is his true body:

But whersoeuer ỹ Sacrament is, there is not his true body:

Ergo he is not present in his true body.

Campion. Proue your Minor: Whersoeuer the Sacramẽt is, there is his true body.

Fulke. Chrysostome denieth it in *cap.* 5. *Matth. Homilia* 12. *operis imperfecti: Sin vasa sanctificata ad priuatos vsus transferre peccatum est & periculum, sicut docet nos Balthasar, qui bibens in calicibus sacratis, de regno depositus & de vita. Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata in priuatos vsus transferre periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis Christi continetur, quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum preparauit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quæ vult.* Here you see Chrysostome doth plainely deny the true body of Christ to be present in the holy vessels, in the which the mysterie or Sacrament thereof is conteined.

Campion. Of al other Doctors he maketh most against you.

Fulke. He maketh nothing against vs for this question, in any place of his workes: but how answere you vnto this place?

Camp. I saye, where the naturall body of Christ is present,

there

there is his true body present.

Fulke. But this Doctor saith cleane contrary, that in the holy vessels is conteyned the misterie of the body of Christ, but not the true body of Christ.

Camp. He speaketh of Balthasars vessels.

Fulke. Although he bringeth Balthasars example of abusing the holy vessels of the Iewes, to shewe howe daungerous it is to conuert holy things to priuate vses: yet he speaketh expresselp of the holy vessels of the Christians, wherein was the mysterie of the body of Christ.

Camp. The chalice may bee abused, after the true body of Christ is taken out of it, and that is a great fault to abuse it, when the body of Christ is not in it.

Fulke. Then he should say, *In quibus non erat:* but he saith, *In quibus non est*, In which the true body of Christ is not.

Campion. Hee talketh of all holy vessels, not onely of the chalice.

Fulke. I graunt he reasoneth from the lesse to the more: if it be dangerous to abuse all holy vessels, namely those, in which the true body of Christ is not, but the misterie thereof: howe much more perilous is it, to abuse the vessels of our body, wherein God dwelleth?

Campion. Doeth he say, that the body of Christ is not in the chalice?

Fulke. He saith it is in none of the vessels:

But the chalice is a vessell:

Ergo it is not in the chalice.

Campion. May not the holy vessels bee abused after masse is done? and so he meaneth that though the body of Christ be not in them when they are abused, yet it is an heinous fault to abuse thē when the Sacrament is taken out.

Here D. Fulke was admonished to rehearse the place in Englisli, that the people might vnderstand.

Fulke. His wordes are plaine, that the true body of Christ is not in them, but the misterie or sacrament thereof.

For if it bee a sinne and daunger to transferre the sanctified vessels vnto priuate vses, as Balthasar doth teach vs, which drinking in the hallowed cuppes, was deposed from his kingdome, and from his life. Therefore if it be so daungerous to transferre vnto priuate vses these sanctified vessels, in which is not the true

body

body of Christ, but a mysterie of the body of Christ is conteined: how much more the vessels of our body, which God hath prepared for a dwelling place to himselfe, ought wee not to yelde vnto the deuill, to doe in them what hee will. The place is so plaine, that no man can denie it: he sayth the mysterie of Christ is contained in the vessels, therefore hee speaketh not of the vessels when they are emptie, but when the sacrament is in them, which he denieth to be the true body of Christ.

Campion. The thing may bee abused after the true body of Christ be taken out, & yet there is a mysterie there, because of the spirituall vse: the meaning is, you must not abuse the thing referred to holy vses, by the example of Balthasar, & therefore the mysterie is alwayes there, when the vessels are emptie.

Fulke. A verie secret mysterie in deede, that is in the emptie chalice. Well, well, I thinke that there is none so simple here, but he may see in what case you stand.

Campion. A mysterie is not alwayes taken in one sense. Why may there not be a mysterie of Christ in ỹ emptie chalice? there is a mysterie of Christ in euery thing. I woulde you might answere me a while to that I could bring out of Chrysostome.

Fulke. You are not allowed to oppose at this time, but I wil answere you in writing whatsoeuer you can bring. As for this matter, al men see how vnable you are to answere. I could helpe you with a better answere my selfe.

Goade. If Christ be present in the sacrament in his naturall body, then his bodily presence must continue so long as the vse of the sacrament continueth, to the worldes ende: 6. Argument.

But Christ touching his bodily presẽce doeth not so continue:

Therefore Christ is not present in the sacrament in his naturall body.

Camp. Christ doeth, and so shall continue his bodily presence to the ende of the world.

Goade. Christ him selfe hath denied his bodily presence or continuance:

Therefore he shall not so continue.

Campon. I denie your antecedent.

Goade. Io. 16. vers. 28. I leaue the worlde and goe to the father. And Math. 26, 11. The poore ye shall haue alwayes with you, but me ye shall not haue alwayes.

Camp. He meaneth, he will not be conuersant in the worlde as then he was, touching his outwarde conuersation, and poore estate: you shall not saith hee, haue me alwayes with you as you haue the poore. Here he was entring into a long tale.

Goade. I looked for this shift before. I will take away your distinction, ye are too full of wordes, ye will not suffer me to goe on with mine argument: you are belike afraide.

It is spoken in respect of his bodily presence simplie: Therefore not in respect of his poore estate.

Campion. Proue what you can: I deny your antecedent.

Goade. I proue it by Saint Augustine, expounding the same wordes of our Sauiour Christ. *Tractat. in Io. 50. Pauperes semper habebitis vobiscum, me autem non semper: loquebatur enim de præsentia corporis sui. Nam secundum maiestatem suam, secundum prouidentiam, secundum ineffabilem & inuisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecce ego vobiscum sum vsque ad consummationem seculi: secundum carnem quam verbum assumpsit, secundum id quòd de virgine natus est &c. non semper habebitis vobiscũ. Ascẽdit in cœlum, & non est hic, ibi est enim: sedet ad dextrã patris, & hic est, non enim recessit præsentia maiestatis. Secundum præsẽtiam maiestatis semper habemus Christum, secundum præsentiam carnis, rectè dictum est discipulis, Me autem non semper habebitis.* The poore ye shall haue alwaies with you, but me ye shal not haue alwaies: he spake this of the presence of his body. For according to his Maiestie, according to his prouidence, according to his vnspeakeable & inuisible grace, that is fulfilled which Christ saide, Lo I am with you to the end of the world: according to the flesh which the word tooke, according to that he was borne of the virgine, &c. you shall not (saith hee) haue me with you alwayes. He is ascended into heauen & is not here: for hee is there sitting at the right hand of the father. And he is here, for hee is not departed according to the presence of his maiestie. According to the presence of his maiestie, we haue Christ alwayes with vs: according to the presence of his flesh, it was well said to his disciples, But me you shal not haue alwayes. Augustine in his first wordes expounded this to be spoken of ỹ bodily presence of Christ, simply.

Campion. It is spoken according to his visible conuersation: Proue any thing against this.

Goade. Augustine excludeth all kinde of bodily presence: Therefore

Therefore it is not spoken according to his visible cõuersation.

Camp. I denie your Antecedent.

Goad. Augustine acknowledgeth onely two kindes of presence of Christ: the one, the bodily presence of his flesh: the other, according to his maiestie, prouidence and inuisible grace. According to this latter kinde he sayth, Christ is present with vs: which he directly opposeth to his bodily presence. Therefore all kinde of bodily presence is excluded.

Campion. There is no contrarietie to that I said before. S. Augustine excludeth not by maiestical presence al bodily presence. Make your Syllogisme, and I will answere you.

Goade. It is more then the vsuall order of disputation, to require a Syllogisme, when I am come to the issue of mine argument, namely to authoritie, as nowe we are come to Augustine: but I wil follow your request: Doe you answere directly, Thus I make mine argument out of Augustines wordes.

Christ is nowe present with his Church touching his maiestie, and vnspeakeable grace:

Therefore by no meanes touching his body.

Campion. I denie your argument.

Goad. Augustines wordes proueth it, making but two kindes of presence of Christ: namely, presence of maiestie, and presence of flesh: and opposeth the one against the other.

Camp. He speaketh not of Christ present in the Sacrament, but of his presence which euery Christian man may haue: hee speaketh according to *Subiectam materiam*, he excludeth not his naturall presence in the Sacrament.

Goad. You answere not the argument out of Augustine. But I will followe you, and proue that he excludeth the presence of Christes naturall body in the Sacrament.

Hee excludeth all presence, saue that by his maiestie, prouidence, and grace:

Ergo he excludeth the presence of Christes naturall body in the Sacrament.

Camp. To your Antecedent I answere: he excludeth all ordinary presence by outward conuersation, & sheweth how Christ is present with euery Christian by his spirit and grace: he speaketh not of his presence in the Sacrament.

Goad. He speaketh generally, excluding all bodily presence.

Therefore aſwell in the Sacrament, as without.

Camp. He ſpeaketh generally, *quoad ſubiectam materiam*, according to the matter that he had in hand.

Goad. You anſwere not ỳ argument. Thus I vrge it briefly.

Chriſt is nowe preſent with his Church, only touching his ſpirit and grace:

Ergo he is no way preſent touching his body.

Mine argument you ſee is grounded vpon Auguſtines plaine wordes, oppoſing the one preſence to the other, *Secundum preſentiam maieſtatis, ſemper habemus Chriſtum, &c.*

Campion. He compareth theſe two together, how he was preſent to his Apoſtles, and how to vs: he talketh generally of an vſual preſence, as euery mã may haue Chriſt preſent by prayer, &c.

Goad. And he maketh Chriſt preſent to vs, none other way but by his maieſtie, and inuiſible grace: and touching all preſence of his fleſh, ſaith it is true, me ye ſhall not haue alwaies. I pray you, would or durſt Auguſtine ſo haue written in ſo plaine wordes abſolutely to allow only of Chriſtes preſence by his grace, denying that touching his bodily preſence we ſhould not alwayes haue him w̃ vs, if Chriſt any way were ſtill bodily preſent vpon earth?

Camp. Yea, I warrant you, being rightly vnderſtood. For he oppoſeth his preſence then, and his preſence nowe, not any more according to viſible conuerſation. And ſo your argument ye would make out of Auguſtine, is not good.

Goad. You vſe not to anſwere the point of the argument, but your maner is to holde you ſtil to one ſhifting diſtinction, though it be often taken away. Your kinde of anſwering is not onely againſt learning, but againſt common ſenſe.

Argument 7. Fulke. I will take another argument.

If Chriſt be preſent in the ſacrament in his natural body, he is preſent in trueth and in deede, not onely in a ſignifying miſterie:

But he is not preſent in the ſacrament in trueth and in deede, but onely in a ſignifying miſterie:

Ergo he is not preſent in his naturall body.

Camp. I denie your Minor: he is preſent in ỳ truth of his body.

Fulke. I proue it out of the Canon Lawe. *De Conſecratione Diſtinct. 2. cap. Hoc eſt. Sicut ergo caleſtis panis qui Chriſti caro eſt, ſuo modo vocatur corpus Chriſti, cum reuera ſit ſacramentũ corporis*

Chriſti,

Christi, illius videlicet quod visibile, quod palpabile, mortale in cruce positũ est, vocaturq́, ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: sic Sacramentum fidei, quod Baptismus intelligitur, fides est. Therefore euen as the heauenly bread which is the flesh of Christ, after a peculiar maner is called the body of Christ, when in deede it is the Sacrament of the body of Christ, to wit, of that body, which being visible, which being palpable, being mortall, was put on the crosse, and euen that immolation of the flesh, which is done by the Priests hands, is called the passion, death, crucifixion of Christ, not in trueth of the thing, but in a signifying mysterie: so the Sacrament of faith, which is vnderstoode to be baptisme, is faith. And the Gloss. hereupon sayth: *Cœlestis, &c. id est, Cœleste Sacramentum, quod verè repræsentat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed impropriè: vnde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio, Vt sit sensus: Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat.* The heauenly bread, that is, the heauenly Sacrament, which truely representeth the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ, but vnproperly: whereupon it is sayd by a peculiar maner, but not in the trueth of the thing, but in a signifying mysterie. So that the sense is, It is called the body of Christ, that is, it signifieth it.

Camp. All this maketh for transubstantiation. That which we see, is called the body of Christ, where in deede, it is but the colour and the accidents.

Fulke. All makes for you: but let vs see whether you can so runne away with the matter. He saith, *Cœlestis panis*, the heauenly bread: can the colour or accidents be called the heauenly bread?

Campion. The meaning is of the accidents and of the signe.

Fulke. This is a strange proposition, *color* or *accidens*, is *cœlestis panis*.

Campion. It is called *Cœlestis panis*, because it is heauenly bread by consecration.

Fulke. That can not be. For he calleth that heauenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ, and after the maner of it the body of Christ:

But accidents are not the flesh of Christ, nor ꝑ body of Christ:

Ergo they are not the heauenly bread.

Campion. If you respect the qualitie, it is the heauenly bread by consecration.

Fulke. It seemeth you knowe not the place: the Glosse sayth the heauenly bread which is the heauenly Sacrament, is called vnproperly the body of Christ, not in trueth of the thing, but in a signifying mysterie.

Camp. Saint Augustine there speaketh popularly. You bewray your slender reading of Augustine, in citing this as Gratians authoritie.

Fulke. It is Gratian in the decrees of your owne Canon law, and the Glosse thereupon. In deede the decree is borowed of Augustine: but it is more fully against the carnall presence, as it is cited by Gratian.

Campion. I will answere both Gratian and the Glosse.

Fulke. Set it downe then in fewe wordes.

Campion. It is called *cœlestis*, in respect of consecration and transubstantiation: bread, in respect that it is bread & wine in outwarde shewe: and for the accidents it is called *Sacramentum* the Scrament, in respect that vnder those outward shewes the naturall body of Christ is present.

Fulke. So you vnderstand the sacrament (which is denyed to be the body of Christ in trueth of the thing) to be ỹ accidents: but it is absurd, that accidents should be called the heauenly bread.

Campion. It is not absurd, if it be heauenly vnderstood: but accidents visibly considered of themselues, import absurditie.

Fulke. The Sacrament is the outward shewe, which is not the body of Christ. I will proue that he taketh the worde Sacrament, for the whole Sacrament, not for the accidents as you doe.

Campion. He speakes of the whole.

Fulke. He speaketh of the whole, and not of the whole: this is manifest contradiction.

Campion. The worde Sacrament, is here taken for the exterior formes, and not for the whole Sacrament.

Fulke. I proue it must be taken for the whole Sacrament, els it could not be compared with Baptisme:

But it is compared with Baptisme:

Ergo he taketh it for the whole Sacrament.

Camp. Your maior I answere: He compareth the element

of

of the ſacrament of ỹ altar, with ỹ element of water in baptiſme.

Fulke. Hee ſpeaketh of the whole Sacrament of Baptiſme, which is called faith, euen as the heauenly bread is called the Sacrament of Chriſt:

But the water of Baptiſme is not called faith:

Ergo he ſpeaketh of the whole Sacrament.

Campion. He reſpecteth the externall ſignes, and compareth ſignes with ſignes.

Fulke. That which he ſpoke of, is called the body of Chriſt:

But the accidents are not called the body of Chriſt:

Ergo accidents are not that he ſpake of.

Campion. This is a booke, and yet I ſee not the ſubſtance of a booke, but whiteneſſe, and other accidents.

Fulke. Who would ſay that whitenes is the booke: none but a madde man: neither will any ſay, that whiteneſſe is the body of Chriſt, or called the body of Chriſt. Therefore by the word of heauenly bread, and of the Sacrament, he meaneth the whole ſacrament. I ſee you haue nothing but ſhameleſſe ſhiftes, againſt ſo cleare authoritie of your owne Canon law ſpeaking againſt you.

Campion. If you dare, let me ſhewe Auguſtine and Chryſoſtome: if you dare.

Fulke. Whatſoeuer you can bring, I haue anſwered already in writing againſt other of your ſide: & yet if you thinke you can adde any thing, put it in writing, and I will anſwere it.

Campion. Prouide me ynke and paper, and I will write.

Fulke. I am not to prouide you ynke and paper.

Campion. I meane, procure me that I may haue libertie to write.

Fulke. I knowe not for what cauſe you are reſtrained of that libertie, and therefore I will not take vpon me to procure it.

Campion. Sue to the Queene, that I may haue libertie to oppoſe, I haue bene nowe thriſe oppoſed, it is reaſon I ſhould oppoſe once.

Fulke. I will not become a ſuter for you.

Camp. Sue to the Queene for me, it is but an eaſie ſuite: you being in ſuch credit with your prince, may (if you dare) procure this matter. Catholikes of their prince can obtaine a greater matter: and are not you Proteſtants in ſuch credit with your Prince,

that

that you can obteine so small a matter?

Fulke. We meane not to trie our credit in this matter. But if you wite any thing, I will answere you in writing.

Campion. Procure it.

Fulke. It were to small purpose: I haue answered already Heskins and Saunders, which are like to bring as much as you.

Campion. I am not worthie to cary their bookes after them. And you your selfe Sir, may be scholer to either of them.

8. Argument. Goade. If Christ be present in his naturall body, he must be present in his true body:

But Christ is not present in his true body:

Ergo not in his naturall body.

Campion. I deny your Minor. He is present in his true body.

Goade. A true body must haue the properties of a true body:

But this hath not the properties of a true body:

Ergo it is not a true body.

Camp. I deny againe your Minor. It hath the properties of a true body.

Goade. Amongst ẏ properties of a true body, this is one special, to be circũscribed in place, & not to be in many places at once.

But in your transubstantiation, Christes body is made to bee in many, yea in infinite places at once:

Ergo it hath not the properties of a true body.

Campion. It is in respect of a miracle, not seene with eye, but with our faith.

Goade. Now you runne againe to miracle. It hath bene before shewed you out of Augustine, that there is no miracle in the Sacrament, and your selfe said that miracles are nowe ceased.

Campion. It is a great miracle to conuert a sinner, yea greater then to make the worlde, and this kinde of miracle is dayly.

Goade. Now you would go from the matter, this is not properly a miracle. But to the purpose, Answere the argument.

That which is in many places at once, is not a true body:

But as you teach, Christ in the Sacrament is bodily in many places at once:

Ergo not a true body.

Campion. The propertie of the fire is to burne, yet the three

children in the fire were not burned. Will you therefore deny that it was truely fire?

Goade. That was in deede and properly a miracle, whereof the Scripture testifieth, which visibly was seene.

Campion. So is this a miracle.

Goade. Beside, it is not sensible, which must bee in a miracle: There is no ground of the worde for it. And faith must be grounded on the worde of God.

Campion. The word teacheth that God is omnipotent.

Goade. You that will reason from Gods omnipotencie, must proove also his will. *Omnia quæ voluit fecit*, Hee hath done all things whatsoeuer he would.

Camp. Nay, you must proue it is not his will.

Goade. I will proue it out of Theodoret. Dialo. 3. qui inscribitur impatibilis, writing of the glorified body of Christ after his resurrection: *Non est mutatum in naturam diuinitatis, sed post resurrectionem est quidem & immortale, & à corruptione & interitu alienum, & diuina gloria plenum: sed tamen corpus est, quod habet propriam circumscriptionem.* The body of Christ is not changed into the nature of his diuinitie, but after his resurrection it is in deede a body immortall, free from corruption, and full of diuine glorie: but yet it is a body that hath a proper circumscription.

Campion. When it pleaseth Christ to worke a miracle, he is not bound to the natural properties, he doth not alwayes practise all his properties. His body ascending into heauen, had the true properties of a body, yet did not then practise them. It is against the naturall propertie of a body to ascend vpward.

Goade. This ascention of Christes body, being an article of our faith, is grounded vpon the worde, that his body was taken vp, & neuertheless remained a true body circumscribed in place. Augustine sayth, we must not take away the trueth of Christes body. Epist. ad Dard. 57. *Cauendum ne ita diuinitatem astruamus hominis, vt veritatem corporis auferamus, cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit.* Wee must take heede, that we doe not so maintayne the Godhead of Christ being man, that we take away the trueth of his body, whereunto hee gaue immortalitie, but tooke not away the nature.

Campion. You neede not bring these places, I graunt that

Christ hath a true body. But you may as well deny the ascension of Christ, being against the propertie of a true body to ascende vpwarde.

Goade. I answered before, that this is an article of our faith, grounded vpon the expresse worde of God. And because we do beleeue by the word, that Christes body is ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of God, and from thence shal come to iudge: therefore we cannot beleeue the cõtrary, that Christ is yet present on earth. So Augustine reasoneth in the same Epistle. *Christus Iesus vbique est per id quod Deus, in cœlo autem per id quod homo. Spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt: & quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt.* Christ Iesus is euery where as he is God, but as he is man, he is in heauen. Take away space of places from bodies, & they shall be in no place: and because in no place, they shall haue no being at all.

Campion. I thinke I haue answered sufficiently: he is present not naturally, but miraculously.

Goade. Why, then ye destroy the propertie of a true bodie, & so consequently take away the trueth of a body.

Campion. I graunt the properties, though the same bee not alwayes put in practise.

Goad. Then sometime Christ may haue many, or rather infinite bodies in many places at one time, when the propertie of a true body ceaseth.

Camp. Nay, it remaineth still one and the same body, though in many places at one time.

Goade. When Christ deliuered his body in his last supper, I pray you, were there not by your opinion two sundrie bodies: namely Christ himselfe the author and actor in the supper, was it not the one: and the bread transubstantiate (as ye will haue it) into Christes body, was it not the other?

Camp. Christ the actor in the Institution, yet was then present in the same body in the Sacrament: if he will haue it so, who can let him? I say he is miraculously in many places at once.

Goade. Nowe we come againe to his will. But I deny that he will haue it so, and you can not proue it. Saint Augustine is flat against you in the forenamed Epistle, writing against the like heretiques of his time, that would take from Christ the properties of a

of a true body, after his glorification, as to be circumscribed in one place. &c.

Cāp. Ye vrge me much with Augustine. Let me shewe for my selfe Augustine, Chrysostome, & others of the fathers, if you dare.

Goade. This is not to answere. Come you to dare? This is like your bolde challenge.

Campion. You may if ye list, procure leaue that I may oppose. Catholiques could easily obtaine a greater matter then this of their princes, and can not you obtaine this of your Prince?

Fulke. We see it is to no purpose. Whatsoeuer you can bring is knowen and answered already. Heskins, Allen, and others of your side, who are farre your betters, I haue already answered. Well, I will go to another argument.

If Christ be present in his naturall body, he is receyued not onely of the godly, but also of the wicked: 9. Argumēt.

But he is not receiued of the wicked:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall body.

Campion. I denie your Minor.

Fulke. I proue the minor out of S. Augustine de ciuitate Dei, lib. 21. cap. 25. *Nec isti ergo dicēdi sunt manducare corpus Christi, quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi, (vt alia taceam) nō possunt simul esse & mēbra Christi, & membra meretricis. Deniq; ipse dicens, qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, & ego in eo, ostendit quid sit, non Sacramento tenus, sed reuera corpus Christi manducare, & eius sanguinem bibere.* Therefore neither is it to be sayd, that these vngodly men do eate the body of Christ, because they are not to bee accompted in the members of Christ, (for to omit other things) they cannot be at one time, both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. Finally he himselfe, saying he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him, sheweth what it is, not so farre as a Sacrament may goe, but in very deede to eate the body of Christ, and to drinke his blood.

Camp. His meaning is, they receyue not the grace of Christ effectually to saluation.

Fulke. His wordes are, they receiue not the bodie of Christ, *reuera* in deede, but *sacramento tenus*, in a sacrament, or sacramentally. Againe he sayeth, that Christ dwelleth not in them:

Ergo they eate not the body of Christ.

Campion. He dwelleth not in them vnto saluation.

Fulke. True, and therefore they eate not his body: for whosoeuer eateth the flesh of Christ, hath Christ dwelling in him to saluation.

Campion. Whosoeuer eateth the flesh of Christ worthily: but the wicked also eate the body of Christ, though vnworthily.

Fulke. He saith expressely they eate not the body of Christ *reuera*, that is in deede, or verily, but sacramentally.

Campion. Wherefore then are they guiltie?

Fulke. That is an other question. And yet one may be guiltie of the Maiestie of the Prince, which refuseth to obey the same, or dispiseth the same: so are they guiltie of the body of Christ, which refuse to receiue it being offered.

Campion. They receiue Christ, but not worthily. He that receiueth Baptisme, receiueth the holy Ghost, or else the Sacrament should not be true: so Saint Paul sayeth, He that eateth the body of Christ vnworthily, is guiltie of the body and blood of Christ.

Fulke. He that receiueth vnworthily, receiueth the sacramẽt: & the Sacrament may be true, though he receiue it vnworthily. Againe, you falsifie the text, when you say, he that eateth the body of Christ vnworthily. Saint Paules words are: He that eateth this bread and drinketh this cuppe of the Lord vnworthily.

Campion. They must either receiue Christ vnworthily, or his grace:

They receiue not the grace of Christ vnworthily:

Ergo they receiue Christ vnworthily.

Fulke. Christ can neuer be separated from his grace. A man may receiue the grace of Christ, though he receiue not his body. But he cannot receiue the body of Christ, but he must also receiue his grace.

Campion. The wicked receiue the body of Christ, but not his grace.

Fulke. So you say: but answere to Saint Augustine, which sayth, The wicked eate not the body of Christ in very deede.

Campion. They eate Christ sacramentally.

Fulke. Yea, but not in deede, as Saint Augustine sayth.

Campion.

Campion. They receiue the same Christ, but not to the same comfort that the godly do.

Fulke. They do not receiue Christ, saith Saint Augustine: because they are not to be accompted in the members of Christ.

Campion. And I say the same.

Fulke. He sayth, they eate not the body of Christ in deede: you affirme that they eate the body of Christ in deede. Againe, Saint Augustine saith, *Hoc est in Christo manere. &c.* This it is to dwell in Christ, that Christ may dwell in vs. For so he sayde this, as though he had sayd, He that dwelleth not in me, and in whome I dwell not, let him not say or thinke he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood.

Camp. The wicked eate the same bodie, but not to the same effect.

Fulke. Augustine saith, they eate not his body *reuera*, in deede: I see you haue no other shift of answere. Therefore I will leaue it to iudgement.

The Apostles receiued not the same body that afterwards was crucified, therefore your solution of the same body, not after the same maner and qualitie, cannot stand. Here M. Lieutenant admonished them that the time was past.

Campion. They receiued the same body, both before and after his passion.

Goade. I will follow the confutation of that absurd assertion, that the wicked eate the body of Christ, which is easie to be improued many wayes. I frame mine argument thus.

Whosoeuer eateth the body of Christ, doeth eate *Rem sacramenti*, The thing or substance of the Sacrament: 10. Argument.

But no wicked or vnbeleuing person, can eate *Rem sacramenti*:

Ergo no wicked person can eate the body of Christ.

Campion. I distinguish of your Maior. *Res sacramenti*, is taken two wayes: for the body of Christ, or the inuisible grace of Christ. The wicked are partakers of the body of Christ, but not of his inuisible grace.

Goade. You can not thus distinguish that which in it selfe is all one, though it differeth in wordes: as the body of Christ, and the thing or substance of the sacrament. Which I proue euidently out of Augustin *in Io. Trac. 25. Huius rei sacramentũ sumit ur quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitum, res vero ipsa cuius sacra-*

mentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicunq; eius particeps fuerit. The sacrament of this thing is receiued of some vnto life, and of some vnto death. But the thing or substance it selfe, whereof the outward signe is a sacrament, is receiued of all men to life, and of none to death, whosoeuer is partaker thereof. Whereby it is manifest, that Saint Augustine doth make but two partes of the sacrament, which he doeth distinguish: viz. the outward signe which he calleth the sacrament, and the inward thing or substance of the sacrament, which is Christ himselfe. And out of the same wordes of Augustine, I followe mine argument thus against your absurde distinction.

Whosoeuer eateth Christ the thing or substance of the Sacrament, shall liue for euer:

But none of the wicked or vnfaithfull shall liue for euer:

Ergo none of the wicked can eate Christ, being the substance of the sacrament.

Camp. If you wil reply vpon mine answere, take my words. The wicked eat not Christ effectually and worthily, according to inuisible grace.

Goade. You answere not mine argument out of Augustine, and as for your words and distinction, it is too absurde to separate the eating of Christ himselfe from effectuall or worthy eating, seeing that whosoeuer eateth Christ the substance of the sacramẽt, doeth liue for euer, and so consequently must needes eate him effectually. Consider the wordes of Augustine, he affirmeth the sacrament to consist of two thinges, the visible signe, which he calleth *Huius rei sacramentum*, and the inuisible grace, or Christ himselfe, which he calleth *Rem sacramẽti*. As also Irenæus saith, the sacrament consisteth of two things: the one earthly, the outward element: and the other heauenly, which is Christ himselfe.

Campion. That part of the sacrament, which is called heauenly, is taken two maner of wayes: either in respect of Christ himselfe, or in respect of the wicked. Christ in himselfe is alwayes heauenly, but to the wicked which receiue not the grace of Christ, he is not heauenly, though he be present, and they receiue him to their condemnation.

Goade. You answere not the reason nor authoritie of Augustine. This was taken away before, none can receiue Christ, but

they

they must also receaue his heauenly grace to eternall life: but my purpose was not to haue vrged this argument.

Fulke. I will vse but one briefe argument.

That which Christ promised to giue in the Sacrament, was not the same which was crucified: 11. Arg.

Ergo it was not the naturall body of Christ which they receaued.

Camp. It was the same which was crucified.

Fulke. S. Augustine denieth it, speaking in the person of Christ in these wordes. *In Psal. 98. Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis & bibituri illum sanguinem quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent: sacramentum aliquod vobis commendaui, spiritualiter intellectum viuificabit vos.* You shall not eate that body which you see, and drinke that blood which they shall shed that shall crucifie me: I haue commended vnto you a certaine sacrament, which being spiritually vnderstoode, shall giue you life.

Campion. This is a fallacion: he denieth *modum*, the maner & not the substãce. Your reason is like this. *Quicquid emisti &c.* that which you haue bought you haue eaten: you haue bought rawe flesh, therefore you haue eaten rawe flesh.

Fulke. You cannot so auoide it, he denieth the same body, and speaketh not of the maner.

Campion. The same body that was crucified we receaue, but not *eodem modo*, after the same maner.

Fulke. Was the maner of his blood shedde, or his very blood in deede?

Camp. His very blood in deede was shed.

Fulke. Why then, that blood which was shedde is denied to be giuen.

Camp. The same body which was crucified, is giuen, but not after the same sort: for when he was crucified, he was mangled and wounded, so he is not nowe, he is giuen after an other sorte.

Fulke. So by your Glosse you make *Corpus* to be in the predicament of qualitie, which is absurde: *Maledicta glossa quæ corrumpit textum.* You haue sodde these colewoyts long enough, the place is plaine, denying the same body and the same blood, and not the maner and sorte thereof.

Camp. The learned knowe mine answere. He is not the same

man

man which he was before, which is altered in qualities.

Fulk. A fine answere in deede: As though Christ should meane that the qualities of his body & blood, should be so altered that they might iustly be saide not to bee the same, although they were the same.

Campion. Augustine vpon the same Psalme, affirmeth the body of Christ is so present in the Sacrament, that it may bee adored.

Fulke. Doeth he say, that the body of Christ may be adored in the sacrament?

Camp. He saith, no man eateth that body, except he adore it.

Fulke. That is an other matter. I say so likewise, that no man receaueth the body of Christ, except hee adore it. But Augustine saith not, except he adore it in the sacrament. But the time will not suffer vs to proceede any further.

12. Argument.

Goade. If Christ be present in the sacrament in his naturall body, thē he is present either in a mortall, or els in a glorified body:

But neither in a mortall, nor yet glorified body:

Ergo he is not present in his naturall body.

Campion. I denie your Minor. Hee is present in his glorified body.

Goade. If he be present in body, it must be the same body that he deliuered to his Apostles in his last supper:

But that was not glorified, but mortall:

Ergo if he be present in any kinde of body, it must bee a mortall body.

Camp. The body of Christ was not yet glorified when the Sacrament was instituted. What of that? it is no matter whether his body were glorified or not glorified.

Goade. Yes, for you affirmed before, that Christ is present in his glorified body, which I haue improued, Christ hauing then a naturall and mortall body, wherein shortly after he was to be glorified, not the same it was after his resurrection.

Camp. A fallation in the same. Glorification doth not make it not the same body: a man sicke and a man whole at sundrie times, yet remaineth the same man.

Goad. My meaning and wordes are plaine, hauing made the comparison betweene mortall and glorified. I made the difference.

to be

to be not in substance but in qualitie: but nowe it appeareth that you must seeke an other place then *Hoc est corpus meum* in the institution, whereon to builde your reall presence. Wee talke what was then at the time of the institution.

Camp. May, we ground sufficiently vpon that place: though Christes bodie be now glorified, yet we do not builde vpon glorification, but vpon the wordes, This is my body, which Christ hath spoken, and therefore it is his body.

Goade. But you are not yet resolued what kinde of body. It is an other now, from that it was then.

Camp. Yet the same bodie, though differing in condition. Christ cannot be wounded now as afore, yet the same flesh.

Goade. I do not denie the same body in substance to bee nowe that was then: but you see that the presence of a glorified bodie which you affirmed, is not grounded vpon *Hoc est corpus meum*. But I leaue this argument.

Goade. Let vs conclude with prayer. Almightie Lorde and mercifull father, we yeelde thee humble thankes for thy manifolde benefites bestowed vpon vs, especially ꝑ thou hast vouchsafed vs the knowledge and loue of thy heauenly trueth contained in thy holy worde, which thou hast denied vnto many others, leauing thē in their owne peruerse blindnes: we beseeche thee to encrease daily in vs more and more the true knowledge of thee, & of thy sonne Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, & vouchsafe to make thy trueth so much the more deare and precious vnto vs, for that it hath enemies that daily seeke to obscure and impugne the same, and as for those that goe astraie, so many of them as pertaine vnto thy kingdome, we beseeche thee in thy good time, to call, to lighten their mindes, and to mollifie their heartes, that we may together with one heart, and one mouth glorifie thee, thorowe our Lord Jesus Christ.

Amen.

The disputation in the afternoone the same day.

The second question or assertion of Campion.

The question. After the wordes of Consecration, the bread and wine are transubstanciated into the body and blood of Christ.

Fulke. LEt vs begime with prayer. O almightie God and most mercifull father, we humbly submitte our selues before thy maiestie, and do vnfainedly acknowledge that our heartes are full of ignorance and blindnes, so that wee cannot vnderstande thy wonderfull trueth by our selues, nor see it when it is reuelled by thee, except it please thy Maiestie by thy holy spirite to lighten our darkenes, & giue sight to our blindnes. Wherefore we humbly beseech thee, to assiste vs by thy grace, and to giue vs sight to see thy trueth, and strength to defende the same against all thine enemies, that the weake may be confirmed, the obstinate confounded, and thy name glorified through Iesus Christ our Lord.

Because you tooke a time to finde those wordes which you reported to be in my booke, and I see the booke in your hand, I pray you reade them if you haue founde them.

Camp. The booke is mistaken, it is not that booke I meant.

Fulke. It is the booke that you named.

Camp. I am sure you do not disclame the opinion.

Fulke. As I tolde you in the forenoone, I do disclame it in such sorte as it was vttered by you, which you are not able to proue to be affirmed by me.

Campion. You make inuocation of Saintes, a matter of great waight.

Fulke. The Church did erre in that point, but not as you Papistes doe erre in it. There is great difference betweene their crrour and yours. But let vs come to the appointed question, which is against Transubstantiation.

I proue

I proue there remaineth the substance of bread and wine in the Sacrament after consecration. The question.

Our Sauiour dranke the same that his Apostles did:

But our Sauiour dranke wine:

Ergo his Apostles dranke wine. 1. Argumẽt.

Camp. I deny that our sauiour dranke of the cõsecrated wine.

Fulke. The wordes of the Euangelist are plaine, that our Sauiour Christ spake, I wil drinke no more from henceforth of the fruite of the vine. These wordes are plaine of wine: for the blood of Christ is not the fruite of the vine.

Camp. This signifieth that our Sauiour did eat indefinitly, whether he did eate of the same bread, or drinke of the same cup of wine which he gaue, I doubt of it: he did eate & drinke with them.

Fulke. He protested that he would not drinke any more of that which he gaue:

But that which he gaue vnto them was wine:

Therefore he dranke of the same wine.

Campion. This text conuinceth it not.

Fulke. Yes, plainely.

Camp. He speaketh of that wine which was drunke at supper, for all was wine, if there had bene 20. gallons before consecration.

Fulke. He speaketh of the wine in his hande: for whereto elle hath the Pronoune (this) relation? After he had taken the cup in his hand, immediatly he sayth, I will not drinke any more of this fruite of the vine.

Camp. He had supped with them, hee had eaten the Paschall lambe with them, he would not take any more repast with them in this life till his resurrection, as afore: therfore it is to be referred to the action that went before.

Fulke. It is plaine that he speaketh of the same wine which he had in his hande, & which he gaue vnto them. And Chrysostomes wordes declare the same in Matth. *Homil. 89. Sed cuius rei gratia non aquam sed vinũ post resurrectionem bibit? pernicioſam quandam hæresin radicitus euellere voluit eorum, qui aqua in mysterijs vtuntur, ita vt ostenderet quia & quando hoc mysterium traderet, vinum tradidit: & iam post resurrectionem in nuda mysterij mensa vino vsus est. Ex germine autẽ (ait) vitis, quæ certè nõ aquam sed vinũ producit.* But for what cause did he not drinke water, but wine after

his resurrection? His purpose was to pull vp by the rootes a certaine pernicious heresie of them which vse water in the mysteries: so that he shewed, that both when he deliuered this mysterie, he deliuered wine, and nowe also after his resurrection, in the onely table of the misterie, he vsed wine. Of the fruite of the vine sayeth he, which verely bringeth foorth wine and not water.

Campion. All this makes for me.

Fulke. You shall heare howe it maketh for you. Here you see, that he dranke of that which he deliuered to his disciples:

And he dranke wine:

Therefore he deliuered wine to his disciples.

Campion. He deliuered that which had the shew of wine: doth he say that he gaue wine?

Fulke. He sayeth, *Vinum tradidit*, He deliuered wine, or hee gaue wine.

Campion. Goe to, he deliuered consecrated wine: He did consecrate wine, and did giue it vnto them.

Fulke. He gaue consecrated wine:

Ergo he gaue wine.

Campion. I denie your argument: for consecrated wine is not wine.

Fulke. Then he gaue wine that was not wine: For Chrysostome sayth, *Vinum tradidit*, He gaue wine.

Campion. He gaue that, that was wine.

Fulke. Chrysostome sayeth, That which hee deliuered was wine when he deliuered it, or else howe did he take away the heresie of those that brought in water, if he had not giuen wine.

Campion. The meaning of Chrysostome is, to bring in wine against those that would haue water. He sayth he deliuered wine, but consecrated wine, to exclude water.

Fulke. He excluded water to bring in wine, and not to shut out both water and wine.

Campion. We vse wine in the mysteries.

Fulke. But he saith, Christ deliuered wine: so doe not you say when you giue the cuppe.

Camp. Hee gaue them that which had the name of wine, and had the shew of it, but now was not in deede wine. As for example,

the

the rod of Moyses was called a rod, after it was turned into a serpent, because it was a rod a litle before.

Fulke. The rod was miraculously turned into a serpent, and returned into a rodde againe: both which miracles were to be iudged by the sense, and yet you proue not that it was called a rodde, while it was a serpent.

Campion. Yes that I do. *Et deuorauit virga Aaron, &c.* And the rod of Aaron deuoured the rod of the enchaunters.

Fulke. Yea Sir, That which was a rodde while Moyses did write, and was a very serpent before Pharao, deuoured the roddes of the Egyptians which were serpents in shew, but rods in deede. Moyses called it a rod when it was a rodde, and not when it was a serpent. Againe, it was a sensible miracle.

Campion. So there is great miracles in the Sacrament.

Fulke. So you say, but none appeareth to our sense.

Campion. They are vnderstood by faith.

Fulke. It is an easie matter so to fayne miracles in euery matter: but God did neuer shewe miracle in conuersion of substances, or any sensible thing, but it was to be iudged by the senses to be a miracle. Bring me one instance of any miracle in conuersion, or in any other sensible thing, that could not be discerned by sense.

Camp. It was a rod a litle before, that after was called a serpent, and yet reteined the name it had before: as *Claudi ambulant, Cæci vident, &c.*

Fulke. That is not denyed, although by you it can not be proued: but here the place is playne. Chrysostome speaketh of the substance of the Sacrament, he deliuered wine, and they receyued wine.

Campion. I haue answered. Leaue the rest to God, and their consciences which are the hearers.

Goade. I will continue to vrge you further with the wordes of the Institution. Your answere can not bee allowed for good, when you would shift off the plaine wordes of our sauiour Christ, calling it wine being the fruite of the vine, and woulde haue this referred to the wine vsed in eating the Pascall, before the institution. You may not so leape backe from the Institution to the Pascall, there was some distance of time betwene the Pascall and

the Supper: so you can not referre this to the whole action.

Camp. You say well. The eating of the paschall Lambe went before, and the Institution followed: and yet I say the wordes of Christ concerning the fruit of the vine, hath relation to the whole.

Goade. Consider the order of the wordes in the Euangelist: As they were eating the Passeouer, Iesus tooke bread, &c. And then after he had deliuered the cup, and bad them all drinke thereof, calling it his blood, then followeth, I say vnto you, I will not drinke hereafter of this fruite of the vine. &c. But I will make my argument from the Institution, thus.

2. Argumēt. The Apostles did eate the substance of breade and wine after consecration, as you terme it:

Therefore there remaineth the substance of breade and wine after consecration.

Campion. I deny your Antecedent.

Goade. That which our Sauiour Christ gaue, the Apostles did eate:

But he gaue bread and wine:

Ergo they did eate bread and wine.

Camp. I deny your minor. He did not giue bread and wine.

Goade. The same which Christ tooke into his handes, he also deliuered:

But he tooke bread and wine:

Ergo he deliuered bread and wine.

Campion. I answere out of Ambrose. Before consecration it was bread, and so he tooke bread, but after the wordes of consecration, he saith it is no bread.

Fulke. You falsifie Ambrose, and would abuse the auditorie, for he doeth not say it is no bread.

Camp. He sayeth there is a chaunge. I pray you let me make one argument out of Ambrose, and answere me if you can.

Goade. Well, make your argument, you shalbe answered.

Campion. Let me borrow the booke. Nowe heare Ambrose wordes lib. de Sacramentis. 4. cap. 4. *Tu forte dicis, panis est vsitatus. Sed panis iste panis est ante verba Sacramentorum: vbi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. Vides ergo quàm operatorius sit sermo Christi: iussit & facta sunt. Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini, vt inciperent esse quæ non erant, quanto magis operatorius*

est

est, vt sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur. Peraduenture thou sayest that it is common bread. But this bread before the sacramentall words is bread: but after consecration, of bread is made the flesh of Christ. Thou seest then of what efficacie the word of Christ is, he commaunded and the creatures were made. If then there is so great force in the worde of the Lorde, that the things that were not, begun to be: how much more is it able to worke, that the things which were, should haue still their being, and be chaunged into other things.

Goad. I know the place, and thus I answere. First ye haue not any worde in Ambrose to exclude the substance of bread. We acknowledge a chaunge with Ambrose, not of one substance into an other, as you would haue to be, but touching the vse whereto the sacrament serueth, namely that which was common bread before, ordeined to a common vse to feede the body, is now conuerted and consecrated to an holy and spirituall vse, to nourish the soule, by feeding vpon Christ by true and liuely faith.

Campion. But Ambrose wordes are plaine, that which before was bread, after consecration *ex pane fit caro Christi*, of bread is made the flesh of Christ.

Goad. Ambrose wordes in deede are plaine in the same chapter, whereby he doeth expound his meaning, the chaunge to be as I haue said touching the vse, and not the substance. *Dicis communem panem, &c.* By these wordes it appeareth, that Ambrose purpose was to confute their opinion, who thought euer basely of the Sacrament, making no difference betweene it & common bread. Thou sayest it is common bread, but thou art deceiued, it is consecrated and chaunged to an holy and heauenly vse, and is become sacramentally the flesh of Christ.

Campion. It is called bread, but it is not bread, for *ex pane fit caro Christi*. And euen as he made heauen and earth by his worde, so by his worde the bread is made his flesh.

Goade. Wee deny not that it is Christes flesh, as him selfe saieth of the bread, This is my body: but it is to be vnderstoode as a sacramentall speach, when the name of the thing is giuen to the signe, as after shalbe shewed out of Augustine.

Camp. The wordes are forcible, of bread is made flesh, & *Sermo Christi est operatorius*, The word of Christ is of power & efficacy.

Goade.

Goade. That is, of common bread is now made Christes body, appointed to be a sacrament of his body. And although this be a wounderfull chaunge by the force of Christes word and institution, that common bread should be chaunged to a spirituall vse, yet Ambrose doeth not say that the substance of bread is chaunged, but rather the contrarie, that the substance doeth still remaine, as appeareth by diuers examples of miracles he alleadgeth in the same chapter, and also by his wordes, *Vt sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur*, That they should remaine and be as they were, & also be chaunged touching the vse. Nowe you haue byged what you can out of Ambrose, I will returne againe to followe mine argument drawen from the wordes of the Institution, as they are explaned by S. Paul. 1. Cor. 10. 16. *Panis quem frangimus, &c.* The bread which we breake, is it not the partaking of the body of Christ? Whereby appeareth, that after sanctification remayneth bread: for he sayth, the bread which we breake, and breaking followeth after blessing or sanctifying. It can not be vnderstoode the body of Christ, for that can not be broken. So by this place, after consecration remaineth bread still.

Campion. It reteineth still the name of bread in diuers respects: first, because it was bread before, and secondly because it hath the shew of bread: as Moyses rod being turned into a serpent, keepeth still the name it had before.

Goade. You are nowe wandring into discourses, I will not followe you. The Apostles plaine wordes taketh away your answere. It followeth in the text, We are all partakers of the same bread, he saith not the same that was bread before: and it is consecrate before it commeth to participation. And the same Apostle in the next chapter, oftentimes repeateth and calleth it breade, when it commeth to be receiued after sanctification.

Campion. I haue giuen you two causes, why it is so called: I will adde the third, because of the analogie betweene the bread and that which feedeth our soules. Make a Syllogisme.

Goade. I byge the wordes of the Apostle, there needeth no Syllogisme: answere plainely and directly.

Campion. I haue giuen three causes, why it is called bread.

Goade. Your causes can not stand. For touching your comparison of the rod turned into a serpent, there appeared a sensible

chaunge

chaunge as is vsuall in miracles, but here is no such thing in the sacrament, and therefore the comparison holdeth not. And for the analogie, it maketh directly against you. For euen as the bread receiued, feedeth the body: so doeth Christ, the soule. But if when it cõmeth to be receiued into the body, there be no bread in deede as you say, then where is your analogie?

Campion. It sufficeth that it was bread before, and so appeareth the analogie by the feeding of our soules.

Goade. What, doeth the bread feede our soules?

Camp. Yea, Christ that is ỳ bread of life, feedeth our soules. Make a Syllogisme, & then we shall see whether your argument hath any face or force.

Goade. We are come to the wordes and authoritie of the Scripture. If the wordes of Christes Institution, and all these manifest places of the Apostle be of no force, thẽ I confesse mine argument to be nothing. I leaue you to iudgement.

Fulke. Your answere is taken away by the worde breaking. The breade which we breake, &c. The bodie of Christ is not broken, but the breade, and not that which appeareth to be breade.

Campion. The bread is broken by qualitie, and not by substance. Can substance be broken?

Fulke. Bread is broken:
And bread is substance:
Therefore substance is broken.
When stickes are broken, shall we say that the substance of them is not broken, but the accciдents? this is foolish Sophistrie. But I will reason thus with you. There is some thing in the Sacrament materiall, which goeth the way of all meates: 3. Argum.
Ergo there is bread and wine.

Campion. Whatsoeuer becommeth of all those qualities, the colour, the taste, the quantitie, &c. it happeneth to them as to accidentes: for it is certaine there remaineth neither breade nor wine.

Fulke. The taste goeth not that way, nor in deede any of the accidentes vnaltered: but heare what Origen sayeth, in Matth. cap. 15. *Quod si quicquid in os ingreditur, in ventrem abit, & in secessum ejicitur, & ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei, perq;*

obsecrationem, iuxta id quod habet materiale in ventrem abit, & in secessum eijcitur. Caterum iuxta precationem quæ illi accessit, pro portione fidei fit vtilis, efficiens vt perspicax fiat animus, spectans ad id quod vtile est. Nec materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo est qui prodest non indignè comedenti illum. Et hæc quidem de typico Symbolicoq; corpore.

Campion. The quantitie is auoyded, and other accidents.

Fulke. It is monstruous that you speake. Origen sayeth, the materiall part of the Sacrament, and the matter of bread. I will reade his wordes in English. If whatsoeuer entreth into the mouth goeth into the bellie, and is cast out into the draught, euen that meate also which is sanctified by the worde of God, and by prayer, according to that which it hath materiall goeth into the belly, and is cast forth into the draught. But according to the prayer which is added vnto it, after the portion of faith, it is made profitable, causing that the minde may be made cleare of sight, looking to that which is profitable. Neither is it the matter of bread, but the worde spoken ouer it, which profiteth him that eateth it not vnworthily. And these things are spoken of the typicall and symbolicall body.

Camp. I haue answered. The accidents goe, the quantitie, qualitie, and such like.

Fulke. The place is plaine. Origen acknowledgeth a materiall part of the Sacrament, which is substance. In what prædicament is *Materia?*

Campion. In none. *Materia* taken indefinitely, is in no prædicament, for it is in all prædicaments. The matter of substance is in substance, of quantitie in quantitie, &c.

Fulke. Wel, then ỹ matter of substance is substãce. The matter of bread is the matter of substance: therfore ỹ matter of bread is substance. Then it is substance and not accidents, which is auoyded by Origens iudgement.

Campion. He saith not, the matter of bread is auoyded.

Fulke. He sayeth that meate which is sanctified, according to that which it hath materiall, is auoyded:

Meate is that which feedeth, accidents feede not:

Therefore accidents are not called meate.

Campion. Accidentes doe feede, and that I will stande to

proue.

proue.

Fulke. Philosophie, Physicke, and Diuinitie, are much beholding to you. It was neuer heard of before, that bare accidents without substance, could feede or nourish.

Camp. He meaneth the matter of the sacrament, and not the materiall substance of bread which is auoyded. The sacrament consisteth of the signe, and the thing signified. The signe is the outwarde shape, whitenesse, quantitie, &c. this is the material part of the Sacrament, which is auoyded.

Fulk. There is no one of these accidents, shape, quantitie, colour, taste, that are auoyded, because they are altered in the stomacke, before they come to the place of auoydance. Againe, it is a shamefull absurditie, to say that the accidents are the meat which is sanctified by the word and prayer.

Camp. I answere, *Id quod habet materiale*, is the matter of the Sacrament, not of the bread.

Fulke. This place is too plaine against you: euery one may see your answere howe vaine it is.

Goad. That which ouerthroweth both the nature and vse of a Sacrament, is not to be admitted: 4. Argum.

But transubstantion doeth ouerthrowe both the nature and vse of a Sacrament:

Ergo it is not to be admitted, and consequently vntrue that you affirme, the bread and wine to be transubstantiate, &c.

Campion. I denie your Minor, it doeth ouerthrowe neither the nature, nor the vse of a Sacrament.

Goade. I must proue both the members seuerally, because you denie both: and first, that it taketh away the nature of a Sacrament. A Sacrament consisteth of two things, the matter, and the forme: the visible signe, and the inuisible grace: the one earthly, and the other heauenly, as Iræneus saith: the element, and the worde according to Augustine, *Accedat verbum ad elementum, & fit Sacramentum.* Let the worde come vnto the element, and so it is made a Sacrament. This being so, then thus I reason.

Whatsoeuer taketh away the element, ouerthroweth the Sacrament: for the word must come vnto the element, as Augustine saith, the element must not depart away:

But transubstantiation taketh away the element:

Ergo Trãsubstantiation ouerthroweth ꝑ nature of ꝑ sacrament.

Campion. I denie your Minor, it doeth not take away the element.

Goade. It taketh away the materiall part, the substance of bread and wine:

Ergo it taketh away the element.

Campion. I say it taketh away neither the heauenly nor the earthly part.

Goade. You answere not directly to mine argument. But I will proue, that it taketh away the earthly part.

It taketh away the substance of bread:

Ergo the earthly part.

Campion. I deny your argument. For there remaineth *res terrestris*, an earthly thing, though the substance be changed.

Goade. What is that earthly thing, if there remaine no substance? Euery Sacrament must consist of the element and the worde: the element is the earthly creature or substance.

Camp. The element doeth not note a substance, there remaineth an earthly creature, the whitenesse of the bread.

Goade. What, can the whitenesse remaine without substance or subiect? The Sacrament must consist of the substance of Christes body, and the substance of bread and wine.

Campion. *Res terrestris*, the earthly thing remaineth, but not the substance: we are come to a nyce point.

Goade. So it seemeth. I will here leaue the first part I had to proue, and now will come to the second, touching the vse of the sacrament: which I will also proue to be destroyed by your transubstantiation. You spake before of the analogie in the Sacrament, there must be a similitude and proportion betweene the signe and the thing signified. As in Baptisme, the element of water washing the bodie, and the holy Ghost through the blood of Christ washing and sanctifying the soule. So in the other Sacrament, as the substance of breade receiued, nourisheth the body: so Christ receiued by faith, nourisheth the soule. Euen as Augustine very well noteth this analogie, in his 23. Epistle, in these wordes. *Si Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sunt Sacramenta non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent, &c. Hac autem similitudine plerunq; ipsarum etiam*

rerum

rerum nomina recipiunt. Sicut ergo secundū quendam modū, Sacramentum corporis Christi Corpus Christi est, Sacramentū sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est: ita sacramentum fidei, fides est. If sacraments had not a certaine resemblance of those thinges whereof they are sacraments, they shoulde not at all be sacraments. And by reason of this resemblance, for the most part they take the names of the thinges themselues. Therefore as the sacrament of the body of Christ, after a certaine maner, is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ, is the blood of Christ: so the sacrament of faith, is called faith.

Nowe this similitude or proporcion by you, is cleane taken away, while ye take away the substance of bread that should norish the body, and so consequently ye take away the nature of a sacrament by Saint Augustines reason.

Campion. The similitude is not taken away, though there remaine no substance of bread and wine, for there remaineth accidents which do nourish. Do not qualities feede? bread may feede by accidents in all the qualities of bread.

Goade. This is strange. I might tell you that this is against Philosophie, that accidents without substance shoulde feede: but we are in diuinitie. The very true and principall vse of this sacrament, is to cōfirme our faith, that as surely as the bread and wine feedeth our bodies, euen as certainely the body & blood of Christ receiued by faith, feedeth and nourisheth our soules.

Nowe by your taking away the substance of bread, wee are brought into doubt of the nourishment of our bodies by the outwarde element, and so consequently of the feeding of our soules by Christ the heauenly bread: and so ye destroy the analogie and chiefe vse of this sacrament.

Campion. When God doth worke a miracle, it is no maruell though there follow wonderfull sequeles. I say, that colour may remaine without substance, and accidents may feede and nourish. I will defend it in the Uniuersitie: I woulde I might haue libertie to defende it.

Goade. What, will you defende that accidentes without substance may nourish? that is too absurde.

Campion. No absurditie at al. If it please God to take away the substance of water, & leaue the qualitie of madefaction, what

hurt were it, might it not be sufficient? And if you will needes vrge the analogie of feeding by the substance, it is sufficient that there was also the substance of bread before consecration, wherein may stand the analogie.

Goade. Let me make it plaine vnto this auditorie, how manifestly you take away the comfortable vse and analogie in this sacrament. When I come to receaue, by this meanes I ought to strengthen my faith, that euen as I knowe most assuredly, that the substance of bread and wine serueth to nourish, and doth feede my body: euen so Iesus Christ being receaued by faith, doth also nourish my soule vnto eternall life. This is a most comfortable analogie or similitude in this sacrament. But if I should beleue that the substance of bread and wine is cleane gone, and though before cõsecration the substance remained, yet before I can receaue the sacrament, the substance is taken away, and there remaine nothing but accidentes: howe can I bee assured that my body is nourished by the outwarde elementes, and so in like maner my soule by feeding on Christ? Thus by your doctrine of Transubstantiation, you ouerthrow both the nature and vse of the sacrament, & would spoile vs of the comfort and strengthning of our faith, which wee should haue by this notable comparison: the ground whereof resteth vpon the certaintie of nourishing our bodies with the substance of the elements.

Camp. Nay, nowe yee preache: I thought ye had come to dispute. Make a Syllogisme.

Goade. I open this more plainely for the edifying of the hearers, that they may the better see the fruite and comfort of your doctrine of transubstantiation.

Campion. I would I might appose: the auncient fathers are all on my side.

Fulke. Not any one of them, ye abuse the auditorie: if you can bring any thing, do it by writing, & I will answere you by writing.

Camp. Mine answere and assertion is, that we are fed by accidents without substance, by that which is left, the quantitie and qualitie.

Goade. Can you shewe any ground or word for this?

Campion. This is word enough for me, *Hoc est corpus meum*, This is my body.

Goade.

Goade. Those wordes doe nothing proue your assertion, as hath bene shewed.

Campion. I would I might be suffered to shewe my cardes, as you haue done yours.

Goade. Whatsoeuer you can shewe is well enough knowen, and hath bene shewed by others of your side, and is sufficiently answered.

Fulke. I reason thus. That which Christ gaue at his supper was bread: Argumẽt 5.

Ergo there remaineth bread in the sacrament.

Campion. I denie that it was bread in substance that he gaue, but onely in shewe.

Fulke. It was pieces of bread that he gaue:

Ergo it was bread.

Camp. He gaue not substantiall pieces.

Fulke. I neuer heard of accidental pieces. But Cyrillus saith, speaking of ỹ sacrament, *Dedit eis fragmenta panis, In Ioh. cap. 4.* He gaue them pieces of bread.

But bread is substance:

Therefore he gaue them pieces of substãce, or substãtial pieces.

Camp. It is all one, to giue pieces, and to giue bread:

The whole is not bread:

Ergo the pieces were not bread. It was consecrated bread.

Fulke. Howe answere you to Cyrillus, that said, he gaue them pieces of bread?

Camp. Euery piece of bread is called bread: he speaketh after the common maner, because it was bread by appellation.

Fulke. What gaue hee? or whereof were those pieces but of bread?

Camp. He gaue pieces of bread in appellation. The Doctors acknowledge it to be no bread.

Fulke. That is vtterly false. The Doctors alwayes called it bread, and pieces of bread: and no Doctor within 600. yeres after Christ saide, that the accidentes of bread and wine onely did remaine, and not the substance.

Camp. I haue answered, and giuen three reasons before, why they called it so.

Fulke. You haue answered nothing: but you teache the Doctors to speake. Name one Doctor for fiue or six hundred yeres after

ter Christ, which saith that there remaineth no substance of bread in the sacrament, or so speaketh as you would expound them.

Campion. The Doctors say, that after consecration the bread is made the body of Christ.

Fulke. I beleeue and confesse as much.

Campion. Then you must beleeue that the substance of bread is turned into the body of Christ.

Fulke. It followeth not.

Campion. Master Doctor, if you feare not your cause, for charitie, answere me. I challenge you, that you can not answere the Doctors.

Fulke. It is not in me to giue you leaue to oppose. I come hether by commandement to oppose you: otherwise as I tolde you the last day, you are not the man whom I woulde take for my aduersarie.

Campion. I speake to you to bee a meane for me. I compare the cause with you, and not my person with you.

Fulke. I haue answered els where, whatsoeuer could be opposed by your betters, Heskins and Saunders: and neuertheles, if you can bring any thing that they haue omitted, put it in writing, and I will answere you, as I haue often said: therefore I will go forward. As Cyrillus calleth the sacraments pieces of bread: so Gelasius calleth it a portion of the holy body, as it is in the decrees cited by Gratian. *Comperimus autem, &c.* We haue found out of a certaintie, that certaine men after they haue receaued a portion of the holy body, do absteine frō the cup of the holy blood, &c.

Camp. Now we shall haue an other disputation, whether the cup be necessarie for lay men.

Fulke. Though the communion vnder both kindes, be proued vnuincibly by that testimonie, yet I bring it onely to shewe that terme (a portiō of the holy body:) which proueth that there remaineth bread which is broken, for the very body of Christ is not broken.

Campion. He calleth it a portion by a popular speach: because the signe being deuided, Christs body is in euery part of ỹ bread, which is not bread in deede, but in apparance only, and so seemeth to be deuided into sundrie parts.

Fulke. This answere of popular speache is with you *Tanquā Delphicus*

Delphicus gladius, to auoid all authoritie that makes against you, be it neuer so plaine: but in deede it is a figuratiue speach, not vsed of the people.

Camp. Is not a figuratiue speach common and popular? They say we drinke the cup, &c. Therefore mine answere is, it is a popular kinde of speache, because when the signe is broken, the thing it selfe is said to be so.

Fulke. Doe the people say, the Lordes body is broken, when they meane that the accidents only are broken? such kind of speaking and meaning, is farre aboue the peoples capacitie.

Camp. The signes are broken, not the body of Christ it selfe.

Fulke. Againe, in that counterfeite Epistle ascribed to Clemens, which he should write vnto S. Iames, exhorting him that he should keepe the Pix diligently from mise dung & putrifaction, he calleth the sacrament which is reserued, *Reliquias fragmentorum corporis Dominici*, The reliques of the fragments of our Lordes body, and *Puluis Dominici corporis*, the dust or small crummes of the Lordes body, and *fragmenta Dominici corporis*, and *fragmenta dominicæ portionis*. The fragments of the Lordes body, the fragments of the Lords portion. What are all these reliques, fragments, dust or crummes, but of bread?

Camp. All these remnants & breakings are in respect of the exteriour forme of bread, an vnproper kinde of speach.

Fulk. These speaches are vnproper of the body of Christ, which cannot be broken: but they are proper of the bread, of the which Cyrillus speaketh plainely.

Camp. Proue you that the substance of bread remaineth, and not the accidents onely.

Fulke. I haue proued that the bread remaineth which is broken: and bread is substance: therefore substance remaineth.

Camp. The signe is broken, but not the bread.

Fulke. You shew your iudgement. We must take al your answeres: when the bread is broken, the signes are broken.

Cam. I could make as good sport about ỹ incarnatiõ of Christ.

Goad. It is no sporting matter: we are in earnest, and about weightie matters.

Fulk. These speaches may become a Iesuite, but are not seemly for a Christian. This is like your iugling tricke the other day, which ye said, belike Christ did play.

Goade. I will now come to examine the ground, whereupon ye would build your transubstantiation: and I reason thus.

6. Argum. If the bread and wine be transubstantiate, then it is grounded vpon some part of the Scripture:

But it is grounded vpon no part thereof:

Ergo the bread and wine are not transubstantiat.

Camp. I deny your Minor, it is grounded vpon some part.

Goad. If vpon any, then vpon the wordes of the institution, This is my body:

But not vpon those wordes:

Ergo vpon no part of Scripture.

Camp. I deny your Minor, It is groũded manifestly vpon those wordes of Christ.

Goad. If vpõ this place, then vpon ẏ true sense of the wordes:

But not vpon the true sense:

Ergo not vpon this place.

Camp. It is groũded both vpon ẏ words, & the true sense also.

Goad. If vpon ẏ true sense, thẽ it is a plaine & a proper speach:

But it is not a proper speache:

Ergo not vpon the true sense.

Camp. It is a proper speache.

Goad. It is a figuratiue speache:

Ergo not a proper.

Camp. So farre forth as it is figuratiue, it is not proper. It may be figuratiue and proper both.

Goad. This is straunge, but ye shall heare the iudgement of ẏ fathers, ẏ it is merely figuratiue. Augustine epist. 23. in ẏ wordes before alleaged, maketh it a Metonymical speach, when by reason of the neere similitude, the name of the thing it self is attributed to the signe: which he saith is vsual in sacraments. So Circumcision is called the Lordes couenant. So the Paschall lambe is called ẏ passeouer. The same Augustine vpon the 3. Psalme, *Christi mirãda patientia adhibuit Iudam ad cõuiuium, in quo corporis & sanguinis sui figuram discipulis tradidit.* The great patience of Christ receaued Iudas vnto his feast, wherein he gaue a figure of his bodie and blood vnto his disciples.

Gen. 17. Exod. 12.

Camp. Wherfore bring ye this, it is from ẏ matter in questiõ: we spake euen nowe of proper speaches, this is not a proper argument to the matter.

Goad.

Goad. I am come to this point orderly to proue the speache to be figuratiue, and not proper, and now ye see your selfe brought in some streightes, ye would drawe me back againe: but answere one place of Tertullian against Marcion lib. 4. Which doth notably expound the wordes of the Institution, to be figuratiuely spoken.

Camp. We shall then go to the forenoones question.

Goade. No, It serueth for the point wee are now come vnto, being verie weightie to expounde the wordes of the Institution, This is my body. Wherupon ye would build your transubstantiation, Belike you feare ỹ place of Tertulliã, & are loth to come to it.

Camp. I feare not, let vs heare it: we lacke a moderator.

Goad. I would we had one, wee shoulde then dispute more orderly. The wordes are: *Christus acceptum panem, & distributum discipulis suis, corpus suũ illud fecit, hoc est corpus meũ dicendo, id est figura corporis mei, figura autem nõ fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.* The bread which Christ tooke & gaue to his disciples, he made his body, saying, this is my body, that is, a figure of my body, but it could not haue bene a figure, vnlesse Christ had a true body.

Camp. I answere your place of Tertullian, two wayes. First, for the vnderstanding of the people, and after, in respect of the learned. For the people thus. He had to do with ỹ heretique Marcion, who denied that Christ had a true body. Tertullian proueth that Christ had a true body, because hee gaue a true body to his disciples, saying, this is my body. The wordes that follow, *Id est, figura corporis mei*, are not Tertullians, but are added by the Heretique, who would haue Christ to haue had but a figure or shew of a body, and not a true body: Tertullian saith to the heretique, Christ saith, this is my body, thou saiest a figure, admit it were a figure, yet it must be a figure of a true bodie.

Goade. You shew your selfe ignorant in this place of Tertull. which is a knowen & familiar place: the whole wordes are Tertullians, & nothing at all here, added by the heretique Marcion: both the wordes & sense of Tertullian is plaine, consider better of them.

Camp. Tertullian tooke vpon him the person of the heretique, & maketh the obiectiõ, which he thought ỹ heretike would obiect.

Goad. You are greatly deceaued in this place of Tertullian, who reasoneth thus against Marcion very substantially, to proue ỹ Christ had a true, & not a phantasticall body as Marcion supposed.

That must needes haue a true bodie, whereof there is a figure: But Christ in the institution of his supper, gaue a figure of his body, when he said, This is my body, that is, a figure of my body: Ergo Christ hath a true body. This is Tertullias reasō, as it appeareth in ỹ next clause. *Figura autē nō esset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.* But there could not be a figure of a body, except it had relation vnto a true body. And in the next words folowing, yet more plainly, *Cœterum vacua res, quod est phātasma, figuram capere non potest.* But an emptie or vaine thing, such as is a phātasme, cā not be capable of a figure. Take the booke and peruse this place, ye shall finde it to be as I haue opened the minde of Tertullian.

Campion. I know the place. I made one answere before in respect of the people, now mine other answere is for the learned: that Tertullian vseth to alleage many harde and obscure places, and figures out of the old testament: he must be read with iudgement and great diligence: the wordes, *Id est figura*, are not in way of exposition, but of obiection.

Goade. You shew your skill in the fathers. This is not Tertullians exposition onely, but also Augustines, vpon the thirde Psalme before alleaged, and *Tom. 6.* against Adamantus. *Non dubitauit Dominus dicere hoc est corpus meum, quum signum daret corporis sui.* The Lord doubted not to say, this is my body, when he gaue a figure of his body.

Camp. Then belike ye woulde altogether exclude from the sacrament, Christ the substance, making him altogether absent, allowing onely of a bare signe in the sacrament.

Goad. The words are Augustines, that Christ gaue a signe of his body. Howbeit, we exclude not the substance, which is Christ him selfe, who together with the signe is receiued by faith of the godly, and so we make not a bare signe, but we say he is not vpon earth touching his body included in the sacrament.

Campion. It is wel knowen to the learned, that the signe excludeth not the thing signified.

Goade. I graunt: neither doe I exclude the thing. It is a sacramentall speache vsual (as hath bene said) in the Scriptures, to giue the name of the thing to the signe, for the similitude betweene both, and therefore must be sacramentally expounded, *propter similitudinem signi, & rei signatæ.*

Camp.

Campion. That maketh for me, that the signe hath the name of the thing.

Goade. Doth it make for you, that ý signe is so termed *Secũdũ quendam modum*, after a certaine maner, as Augustine saith before, and yet simply is not so? The Sacrament is not the thing it selfe, but in a kinde of speach sacramentally: as Circumcision is said to be the couenant, which was not the couenant it selfe, but a signe thereof.

Campion. Make your argument.

Goade. Seeing ye will haue me drawe it into an argument, thus I reason.

It is vsuall in the Sacramentes, for the Scripture to speake figuratiuely, calling the signe by the name of the thing signified, as in Circumcision, Gene. 17. the Paschall Lambe, Exod. 12. and the rocke in the wildernes, 1. Cor. 10:

Therefore the like in this sacrament of the Lords supper.

Campion. I denie your argument, they are not alike.

Goade. I proue it. The same reason of Augustine from the analogie to take the name of the thing, holdeth in all sacraments: Ergo in this. And for example he bringeth this: *Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum Sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est*, Therefore as the Sacrament of Christs body, after a certaine maner is saide to be the body of Christ, &c. Also the very maner of speach in the other Sacraments is like, viz. of circumcision, This is my Couenant: of the Paschall, This is the Passeouer: of the rocke, The rocke was Christ.

Camp. I say they are not like, for Christ was not naturally present in those sacraments of the olde Testament, as he is in this Sacrament.

Goade. You bring an instance by *Petitio principij*, but I ouerthowe your particular instance by the generall.

The like vsuall speache is vsed in all Sacraments both of the olde and newe Testament:

Ergo in this sacrament of the Supper.

Camp. The speache & sense is this in the sacrament, *Hoc est corpus meum*, This that I see is my body, as the quãtitie & colour.

Goade. You answer not mine argument, I haue said inough for the true vnderstanding of these woordes, it must haue a sacra-

mentall sense. I leaue it vnto iudgement.

Camp. I graunt a sacramentall sense, so farre forth as goeth to colour. The fathers you alleadge, but those that I bring can not be answered.

Fulke. They haue bene, and may be, as time and occasion will serue: but nowe your lot is to answere. I will take away your common and onely answere.

Campion. I haue answered already.

Fulke. Your answere sheweth, that you vnderstande not the scope and purpose of Saint Augustine, which is to proue that this saying, *Anima est sanguis*, is such a kinde of speach, as this of the sacrament, This is my body. For these are his words: *Nam ex eo quod scriptum est, &c.* For of that which is written, that the blood of a beast is the soule of it, beside that which I said before, that it perteineth not vnto me what becõmeth of ỹ soule of a beast, I can also interpret this commandement to be made in a signe: for our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gaue the signe of his body. Here you see, Augustine hauing disputatiõ with the heretique Adimantus, which helde that the blood of a beast was the soule thereof, affirmeth that the blood is but a signe of the soule, as the sacrament is a signe of the body of Christ: and yet is called the soule, as the other is called the body of Christ.

Campion. You are answered already.

Fulke. This is your common answere: You are answered already, and you haue answered your selfe, when you haue none other shift. You vnderstand neuer a place of the Doctors, that hath bene yet alleadged.

Campion. Twentie yeres agoe I haue read this booke.

Fulke. I do not beleeue that euer you read it, you are so ignorant of the argument of it. But sure I am, that xx. yeres agoe you had not read it. You would seeme to be an older student in Diuinitie then you are, by a great deale.

M. Norton. Where were you Campion, twenty yeres agoe: were you not a poore boy in the hospitall:

Camp. I was two and twentie yeeres olde, and then I was Bacheler of Art.

Fulke. You might reade that place noted out by some other, but the whole worke of the autor you read not.

Campion,

Camp. I did not say that I had then read his whole worke.

Fulke. It is not a dosen yeres ago, since I heard you at Garbrandes staule in Oxenforde aske for Irenæus Epistles, wherein you shewed that you were but a yong reader of the Doctors at that time.

Camp. Peraduenture I might aske for Irenæus workes.

Fulke. May, you asked for Irenæus Epistles, and namely, that to Victor.

Campion. Why might I not, hauing read in Eusebius of his Epistle to Victor, aske of the Stationer, whether that Epistle were extant?

Fulke. I deny not but you might: but yet that argueth that you were but a yong man in the Doctors, that knewe not what workes of Irenæus were extant. But howe answere you to Saint Augustine?

Campion. I answere, Saint Augustine sayth, that *Sanguis* is a signe of the soule present, as the bread is a signe of the bodie of Christ being present.

Fulke. Saint Augustine sayth, that the blood doth onely signifie the soule, and is not the substance of the soule: but you vtterly destroy his argument, and so, helpe the heretique very well.

Camp. The heretique thought it was an absurditie, that *Sanguis* being eaten, *anima* is eaten. Augustine sheweth, because *Sanguis* is a principal part of life, it is called the vitall blood, &c. Like as this *Sanguis* is a token that *Anima* is neere, so the signe of the bread is a token that Christ is neare.

Fulke. You go quite from the matter. The question was not whether the blood be a signe of the soule, but whether it bee the soule it selfe.

Campion. Let it be noted: why is blood called *Anima*, but because *Anima* is neare it, & because it exerciseth his functions therein? So he gaue bread, that was a signe of his body present. The question was neuer, whether the blood were the substance of the soule, but whether the blood being eaten, the soule were eaten? Therefore in that saying of Saint Augustine, Christ doubted not to say he gaue his body, when he gaue a signe of his body: there, signe, is a token of his presence.

Fulke. That is a meere fallacion: signe a token of presence, as

blood

blood a signe that *Anima* is neere: Augustine is cleare, that the blood is not the soule, but a signe thereof: as that which Christ gaue, was not his bodie, but a signe thereof. Or els the heretique had his purpose, in saying, ỳ eating of blood, is eating of soules.

Campion. I must not eate his blood.

Fulke. You haue many words to no purpose in the world.

Campion. Why is a mans hayne called his witte? It were reason ỳ I also should haue my course sometimes to oppose, and you to answere: which if it fell so forth, I doubt not but I could vrge you as well in these matters, as you do me: and driue you also to narrowe shifts, in the defence, howe Christ tooke flesh of the virgine Marie.

Fulke. To take vpon me the person of an answerer, is not my choyse and yours: as also the place of opponent, which I nowe susteine, was not sought for by me. And to graunt that which you nowe require, resteth in the superior powers.

Camp. Well then, vse the helpe of your friends to sue for obteining of the same. For, if you or the like were in Catholique cities, that I know, and did but once signifie your desire in the like case, free disputation and conference would out of hand be procured. And I in my defence challenge you here, if you dare, to answere to such poynts as I shall obiect against you.

Fulke. I will make no suite for the matter, neither are you the man whom I would choose mine aduersarie, to matche my selfe withall.

Camp. In deede, I thinke to obteine that suite, would not be for your aduantage.

Fulke. Thinke of your selfe as highly as you list, yet when you haue reckened all, your gaine will be litle or nothing. I will come to mine argument.

The elements go not from their nature and substance:

Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion. I deny your Antecedent.

Fulke. I proue it by authoritie of Theodoret Dialog. 2. *Neq; enim signa mystica post sanctificationem recedunt à natura sua. Manent enim in priori substantia, figura, & forma, & videri & tangi possunt sicut prius.* For the mysticall signes after sanctification doe not go from their nature. For they remayne in their former sub-

stance

stance, shape, and forme, they may both be seene and touched, as before.

Camp. I answere, he is so to be vnderstoode, as he may confound the heretique, with whom he did dispute.

Fulke. Very well, and for that purpose he sayth, the nature of the signes remaineth, to proue that the nature of Christes humanitie remaineth after the assumption.

Campion. Nature is not taken for substance.

Fulke. Theodoret sayeth, they remayne also in their former substance.

Campion. He speaketh popularly, hee must not be taken so strictly. The word substance is often times taken for being, therefore it must not be here taken for a speciall substance, but *genericè*, for a generall being.

Fulke. Then it woulde followe, that the proper substance of Christes body remaineth not, but a generall being thereof.

Camp. The heretique graunted that Christ had a body, but he said it was a phantasticall body, and not a true body.

Fulke. And your answere will helpe the heretike very well. As the signes remaine not in their proper substance, but in a generall being or accidents: so the humanitie of Christ after it was assumpted by the Diuinitie, was absorpte of the same. But Theodoret against the Eutichean, by the similitude of the mysticall signes remayning in their nature and substance after sanctification, proueth the veritie of Christes humanitie after his incarnation.

Campion. You must not presse the similitude so: substance is taken generally for being.

Fulke. You were best to say as Saunders doeth, that substance is taken for the bulke of the bread, though there be no bread.

Campion. I say it is an vnproper speach.

Fulke. If euer we must speake properly, we must do it when we dispute against heretiques, as Theodoret did.

Camp. I haue answered: by substance he meaneth a being, and such haue accidents.

Fulke. That answere wil not stand with Theoderets words. For Christ hath not nowe those accidentes with the which hee was incarnate, but the same substance. You shall heare the ar-

gument of Epanister the heretique. As the symbols of the bodie and blood of our Lord are one thing before inuocation, and after inuocation are changed and made other things: so the Lordes body after the assumption, is chaunged into the diuine substance. But Theodoret telleth him, that he is taken with his owne nette. For the mysticall signes depart not from their nature, but abide in their former substance, forme and shape. Here you see he speaketh both of substance and accidents.

Campion. I graunt, so farre forth as it made against the heretique.

Fulke. But it maketh not against the heretique, vnlesse transubstantiation be denied.

Campion. Yes, it maketh against the heretique, that the bread being turned into the very bodie of Christ, prooueth that Christ had a true body.

Fulke. You doe open violence to the place. His argument is not of the bodie of Christ, to prooue his humanitie: but by the remayning of the mysticall signes in their former substance and accidents, to proue the perfite remayning of Christes humanitie after his incarnation.

Campion. Euery argument vsed by the Fathers, must not bee pressed farther then their purpose, which was to confounde heretiques.

Fulke. But herewithal is his minde expressed against the heresie of transubstantiation.

Camp. I graunt it doth cary some suspition against transubstantiation, but it doeth not make against it.

Absurde: Substance must be in a certaine vacant or voyde emptines, and yet forsooth in quantitie and qualitie.

Fulke. He could not more plainly haue spoken against it, then to say, the nature and substance, forme and shape remayneth in the bread and wine after sanctification.

Campion. He is to be vnderstood, that the substance doeth remayne *in vacuitate, sed tamen quantitate & qualitate. &c.*

8. Argumēt.

Fulke. Euery man may see howe seely shiftes you be driuen vnto, and howe farre you roue from that auncient fathers meaning. I will presse you with another authoritie.

Goade. I will vrge you with an other argument out of the same author, whereby his iudgement shall appeare in moe places then one, that he is flat against transubstantiation: his wordes are

these,

these, dialog. 1. qui dicitur Immutabilis. *Volebat enim eos qui sunt diuinorum mysteriorum participes, non attendere naturam eorum quæ videntur, sed propter nominum permutationem, mutationem quæ fit ex gratia, credere. Qui enim quod natura corpus est, triticum & panem appellauit, & vitem rursus seipsum nominauit, is symbola & signa quæ videntur, appellatione corporis & sanguinis honorauit: non naturam quidem mutans, sed naturæ gratiam adijciens.* For he would haue those which are partakers of the diuine mysteries, not to regard the nature of those thinges that are seene, but for the chaunge of the names, to beleeue that chaunge which is made by grace. For he which called that which by nature is his body, corne & bread, and againe called himselfe a vine, euen he did honor the symbols & signes which are seene, with the name of his body and blood: not chaunging nature, but adding grace vnto nature. Out of which wordes I reason thus.

The symbols and signes remayne in their owne nature after they be consecrate:

Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion. In great and weightie matters they are forced to vse these termes, he speaketh *generice* generally, not strictly.

Goade. You answere nothing to the place: reade the wordes, and consider them better. He speaketh plainely, and in speciall of the nature and substance of the sacrament still remaining.

Camp. I haue answered before, that by nature he meaneth the exterior forme, as accidents and qualitie.

Goade. By nature it is plaine he meaneth the very substance: for he doeth confound these two, as appeared in his other place before alleadged. *Non recedunt à natura sua, manent enim in priori substantia.* They leaue not their nature, for they abide in their former substance. When you finde the worde nature sometime in the fathers, ỳ seemeth to make for your transubstantiation, then you triumph, then you vrge the worde that it must needes signifie substance. Now when the same worde is vrged against you out of Theodoret, and the same Theodoret explaning also himselfe, that he meaneth the very substance of bread and wine, yet it must bee nothing but qualitie and accidents.

Camp. When the coherence of the place yeeldeth it, then we say it must signifie the substance. It can not alwayes be taken for

the ſubſtance. For I pray you, is not heate the nature of the fire? yet it is not the ſubſtance of the fire.

Goade. Heate is a propertie of the fire. But what is this to the anſwering of Theodorets place, where both the coherence and his owne expoſition, doeth ſhewe it to be all one with the ſubſtance?

Campion. I haue anſwered, the ſubſtantiall part doeth not remayne.

Goade. Then I ſee, we ſhal haue none other anſwere to Theodoret. I will proue howe you will anſwere Iuſtinus Martyr, in his Apologie.

Campion. Theſe Doctors were great Philoſophers, and therefore no maruaile though ſometime they ſpeake as they were wont.

Goade. The ſubſtance of bread and wine remaineth:
Ergo they are not chaunged.

Campion. It doeth not remayne.

Goade. That which nouriſheth the body, remayneth:
But the ſubſtance of bread and wine nouriſheth the body:
Ergo the ſubſtance of bread and wine remayneth.

Campion. This is anſwered already. When the ſubſtance is preſent, it nouriſheth by the qualitie.

Goade. But the qualitie can by no meanes nouriſh without the ſubſtance.

Campion. The qualitie nouriſheth alone, if it can bee there without ſubſtance.

Goade. But it can not be there without a ſubiect. Now conſider the wordes of Iuſtinus in 2. Apologia. *Non enim vt communem panem aut communem potum hæc accipimus, ſed quemadmodum Ieſus Chriſtus ſeruator noſter per verbum Dei factus caro, & carnem & ſanguinem noſtræ ſalutis cauſa habuit: ſic etiam cibum illum, poſtquam per precationem verbi illius fuerit benedictus, ex quo ſanguis & caro noſtra per mutationem nutriuntur, edocti ſumus eſſe carnem & ſanguinem illius. &c.* For we doe not receiue theſe things as cõmon bread & common drinke, but as Ieſus Chriſt our ſauiour, being made fleſh by the worde of God, had both fleſh & blood for our ſaluation: ſo alſo we are taught, that that meate, after it is ſanctified by prayer of the word, by which

meate

meate our flesh and blood is by chaunge thereof nourished, is the flesh and blood of him.

Camp. The accidentes alone whersoeuer they be, they may nourish.

Goad. You speake against learning, reason, & sense. Will you say, that accidentes without substance, can nourish our blood and flesh?

Camp. That is, *physica quadam ratione*, naturally it can not be: but where there is a miracle supernaturall, the miracle being graunted, the other followeth.

Goad. But your imagined miracle is denied, and it hath bene shewed out of Augustine, that there is no wonder in the sacramentes. This is an easie answere to all arguments, when ye haue nothing els, then to say it is a miracle: and this is your common answere.

Camp. When the substance is present, the qualitie nourisheth. I would this question might be handled in the Uniuersitie.

Fulke. You would faine be remoued, but it lieth not in vs to remoue you. Gelasius against Eutiches, writeth thus: *Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi, diuina res est, propter quod, & per eadem, diuinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Et certè imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi, in actione mysteriorũ corporis Christi celebratur. &c.* The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receiue, are a diuine thing, and therfore by them we are made partakers of the diuine nature, & yet the substance, or nature of the bread & wine ceaseth not to be. And surely a similitude or image of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the mysteries. Therefore, it is shewed vnto vs euidently enough, that we must iudge the same thing cuẽ in our Lord Christ him selfe which wee professe, celebrate and receiue in that which is an image of him: that as by the working of the holy Ghost, these things passe into a diuine substance, and yet abide still in the propertie of their owne nature: euen so the same principall mysterie doeth shewe that one Christ, whose efficiencie and trueth it doth truely represent vnto vs, abideth whole & true, those things of which he cõsisteth properly, still remaining. What say you to this plaine testimonie of Gelasius, who saith, the sub- Argumẽt 9.

stance of the bread and wine remaineth.

Campion. Make your argument.

Fulke. I haue made it already.

The substance of the bread and wine remaineth:

Ergo there is no transubstantiation.

Campion. I denie your Antecedent.

Fulke. The wordes of Gelasius proueth it.

The substance of bread and wine departeth not:

Ergo it remaineth.

Camp. Gelasius and Theodoret haue one answere: in the misteries, which are the bodie of Christ, there remaineth that which appeareth bread and wine.

Fulke. Gelasius saieth, the substance of bread and wine remaineth, and not the appearance only: and so saith Theodoret.

Campion. I tolde you they meane to proue that there is not a third thing, as a phantasticall body, but one Christ, God and man.

Fulke. This is nothing to the purpose. The substance of the bread and wine ceaseth not to be in the sacrament: for your credit sake, answere to the authoritie. Gelasius was a Pope, hee coulde not erre.

Camp. The substance of the bread and wine remaineth, that is, the being.

Fulke. Euen nowe, you denied my Antecedent, and now you graunt it: you go backward and forward. In deede you knowe not what to say.

Camp. His answere is, substance is taken for being.

Fulke. What being, a generall being?

Camp. Such a being, as is in all the predicamentes.

Fulke. Ergo the sacrament is a transcendent.

Camp. I denie the argument.

Fulke. The bread and wine are the sacrament:

Bread and wine are transcendentes:

Ergo the sacrament is a transcendent.

Camp. The being of them both after consecration, is a transcendent: the bread is a sacrament, as it is a signe.

Fulke. Take the sacrament for a signe, and then you will say, it is a transcendent, which is in all predicaments. I pray you what remaineth?

Campion.

Campion. *Aliquid*, the signes of bread and wine.

Fulke. *Hoc aliquid nihil est*. There remaineth the substance of bread and wine, saith Gelasius, that is to say, the accidentes, as you expound him. By like reason you may expounde him by white, to meane blacke, by hoate, colde: you might as well say, when hee speaketh of God, hee meaneth the deuill, by such monstrous interpretations, all heresies may be defended.

Camp. Your arguments cary a shew, because you reason physically: but we must not be led by senses in these misteries.

Fulke. I reason truely: and trueth is able to stande with all true sciences against all gainsaiers.

Goad. There remaineth the substance of one of the elements: Ergo there remaineth the substance of both. 10. Argument.

Camp. There remaineth substance in neither.

Goade. The substance of the wine remaineth: Ergo of the one.

Camp. Wine doeth not remaine substantially.

Goade. *Cyprian epist. 3. ad Cæcilium. Dico vobis non bibam amodo ex ista creatura vitis, vsq; in diem illum quo vobiscum bibam nouum vinum in regno patris mei. Qua in parte inuenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse quod sanguinem suum dixit.* I say vnto you, I will not drinke hereafter of this creature of the vine, vntill the day that I shal drinke it new with you in the kingdome of my father. In which parte, we finde the cup which the Lord offered, to be mixed, and that it was wine which he called his blood. By these wordes it appeareth that wine remaineth. He saith, we finde that it was wine, &c.

Campion. His intent is to proue that Christ did consecrate in wine, and so must we do: he doth not call it wine after consecratiõ.

Goade. I proue that his meaning is after consecration, as Christ him selfe doth call it, whose wordes he doth recite.

He saith, it was wine which he offered, and called his blood:
But he did not offer and call it his blood till after consecration:
Therefore it was wine after consecration.

Campion. That is, hee tooke wine to make it his blood, and when he tooke it, it was wine: he saith not, that when Christ did offer it, it was wine.

Goade. He saith that it was wine, which he called his blood, & he did not call it his blood before consecration. I leaue the place to the

the iudgement of the learned. I will farther confirme this out of Irenæus. There remaineth an earthly substãce after consecratiõ:

Ergo there is not transubstantiation.

Camp. There doth not remaine any substance.

Goade. Heare his wordes, *Iren. aduer. hereses lib. 4. cap. 34. Iam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constãs, terrena & cœlesti. Cœleste hoc quidnã est? Dominus Iesus. Terrestre autem quid? panis qui ex terra est, quiq; corpora nostra pascit quemadmodum reliqui panes.* Nowe it is not common bread, but the Eucharist consisting of two things, one earthly, and the other heauenly. This heauenly what is it? the Lorde Iesus. And what is the earthly? bread which is of the earth, and which doth feede our body as other bread doth.

Camp. He saith the sacrament consisteth of two things. There be nine predicaments beside that of substance, and this word *Res*, or thing, may be in them all, and they may bee all saide to be earthly things.

Goade. You can not so shift of Irenæus plaine wordes. I will proue that *Res*, in this place, must needes signifie a substance.

Sacramentes consist of two substances, the one earthly, and the other heauenly:

Therefore, it must needes be vnderstoode of substance.

Campion. I deny that they consist of two substances: they consist of two things.

Goad. You will graunt that Christ the inuisible grace, is one substance: and so that part of the sacrament which is heauenly, is a substance. The earthly part, namely the elementes of bread and wine, remaine also in their proper substance: for as Irenæus saith, the bread is of the earth, and doeth nourish our bodies, as other bread doeth.

Campion. It is inough to consiste of two thinges: of Christ, and the grace of Christ. An euill man may receiue Christ, but not the grace of Christ.

Goade. Do you make the two things to bee Christ and his grace: thẽ one of these two must be earthly, according to Irenæus. And it hath bene confuted before, that the wicked can not eate Christ: for whosoeuer is partaker of Christ, must also be partaker of his spirit and grace.

Camp.

Campion. I say that the wicked may receaue Christ, yet to their condemnation, when they receaue that part of the sacramẽt which Irenæus calleth the thing earthly, being not the substance, but the accidents.

Goade. The wicked receaue the sacrament, the thing earthly, to their condemnation: but Christ they receaue not. I haue before proued that by the earthly thing must needes bee vnderstoode the substance: but ye are much beholding to accidentes and miracle, they haue helped you well to daye, when yee had nothing els to answere.

Fulke. Irenæus calleth the sacrament a sacrifice. I thinke you like the phrase in regard of your masse, but he saith, it was such a sacrifice as doth not sanctifie the offerer. lib. 4. cap. 34.

Therefore it was bread and wine.

Camp. You say that it is a sacrifice, so it is in deede: but hee meaneth by the offerer, Christ which doth sanctifie, not man.

Fulke. He meaneth cleane cõtrary, you shall heare him speake: he meaneth man.

Campion. Man is also the offerer, after a sort.

Fulke. You hurt your selfe, because you will not heare the place, but take vpon you to answere you knowe not to what. His wordes are (speaking of the sacrament) *Igitur sacrificia non sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget sacrificio Deus: sed conscientia eius qui offert sanctificat sacrificium pura existens, & præstat acceptare Deum quasi ab amico.* Therefore the sacrifices do not sanctifie the man, for God needeth no sacrifice: but the conscience of him that offereth being pure, sanctifieth the sacrifice, & causeth God to accept it as of a friend. Hereof I inferre:

That which ỹ conscience of mã must sacrifice, is bread & wine:

Therefore the sacrifice is bread and wine.

Campion. He meaneth, except the conscience of the offerer be pure, it sanctifieth not the man.

Fulke. Not onely that, but hee saith the pure conscience doeth sanctifie the sacrifice.

But no mans conscience doth sanctifie the body of Christ:

Therefore the sacrifice of bread and wine, are not the body of Christ.

Camp. The pure conscience maketh it an holy sacrifice to

him that offereth, but otherwise it is holy of it selfe.

Fulke. Irenæus affirmeth, that the sacrifice hath no sanctification, but of the pure conscience of the offerer.

Campion. If that be wanting, it signifieth not the man that is holy.

Fulke. But if his conscience be neuer so pure, it sanctifieth not the bodie of Christ:

Therefore there is no way for you to escape.

Goad. If there bee transubstantiation, then Christ is really present in his true body:

12. Argum. But Christ is not really present in his true body:

Ergo there is not transubstantiation.

Camp. Christ is really present in his true body.

Goade. He is not present in his sensible body:

Therefore not in his true body.

Campion. I deny your argument.

Goade. It is the argument of our Sauiour Christ, who neither deceiueth, nor can be deceiued, Luk. 24.39. See my handes and my feete that it is I, handle me, and see, &c. Here Christ proueth his true body to be present by the senses of seeing and handling, as reasoning thus:

You see and feele my body:

Therefore I am present in my true body.

And it is not a spirite as you feare: as, if he could not haue bene seene and handled, then not to be beleeued to be his true body.

Camp. The argumēt of Christ is good. The body that might be felt, must needes be a true body. The body of Christ is alwayes sensible, but he doth whē it pleaseth him, withdraw this propertie.

Goad. Then by our Sauiour Christes reason, we may doubt of the trueth of his body.

Camp. It is said of Christ, that he vanished out of their sight, yet his body was visible. And can not Christ bee present nowe without our seeing him?

Goad. He was taken out of their sight, and then howe could they see him? but you say his body is present with vs. Will you chalenge more vnto you then Christ him selfe doth? It pleased Christ to be iudged by our senses, touching the presence of his body, our senses do see, feele, smell and taste nothing but bread.

Camp.

Campion. Chriſtes pleaſure is enough: did the ſouldiers ſee him riſe out of his ſepulchre?

Goad. It pleaſed the Lorde to holde their eyes, they being aſtoniſhed for feare: ſo when he holdeth our eyes, it is true that wee can not vſe this ſenſe.

Campion. Then his body may be inſenſible to vs if he will, & yet he in him ſelfe is alwayes ſenſible: ſo the cauſe of not ſeeing him, is in him, and not in mine eye.

Goade. Yea, if our eyes were holden that we could not ſee: but it is manifeſt that the Apoſtles knewe nothing of this doctrine of reall preſence in the ſacrament before Chriſtes reſurrection. For if they had bene taught before in the inſtitution, that Chriſt was preſent in the ſacrament in his naturall bodie, and yet they ſawe and handled nothing els but bread, this argument nowe after his reſurrection drawen from their ſenſes, had bene of ſmall force.

Campion. Ye haue heard mine anſwere, though now it pleaſed him to ſhew him ſelfe palpable, yet there may bee impediment in him, and alſo in vs, why this is not alwayes ſo. Here was no miracle when Chriſt did thus ſhewe him ſelfe, but Chriſt wilbe preſent in the ſacrament miraculouſly.

Goad. Let vs ende with prayer. Wee yelde thee humble thankes moſt gracious God and merciful father, that it hath pleaſed thee to call vs to the knowledge and profeſſion of thine euerlaſting trueth reuealed in thine holy worde: and although it bee the lotte & condition of the ſame truthe, alwayes to haue aduerſaries and gainſayers, that ſet themſelues againſt the cleare light of thy word: yet we beſeech thee ſo to eſtabliſh and confirme our faith in the knowen trueth, that we be neuer offended by reaſon of erroꝛs and heretiques, knowing that as there hath bene alwayes amongſt thy people, ſo there wilbe ſtill falſe prophets, which priuily ſhall bring in damnable hereſies: yea there muſt be hereſies in the Church, that they which are approued, may be knowen. But rather, O Lord, by this meanes ſtirre vs vp the more to ſtudy and meditate in thy lawe. And ſpecially vouchſafe to worke in our heartes a greater meaſure of zeale and loue towardes thy truthe, ſeeing that of thy iuſt iudgement thou vſeſt to ſende ſtrong deluſions, that they ſhould beleeue lyes, which woulde not receiue the loue of thy trueth. And amongeſt the multitude of thoſe that wander

2. Pet. 2.
1. Cor. 11.
2. Theſſ. 2.

der in blindnes and errour, wee beseeche thee in thy good time, so many of them as pertaine vnto thy kingdome, of thy mercie to conuert, and the rest that are obstinate against thy trueth and glorie, of thy iust iudgement to confounde: and finally to breake the might of Sathan by the power of our Lord Iesus Christ, to whome with thee and the holy spirit, be all glorie now and euer. Amen.

William Fulke.
Roger Goade.

A remembrance of

the conferences had in the Tower of London, betwixt M.D. Walker, and M. William Charke opponents, & Edmund Campion Iesuite respondent, the 27. of September, 1581. as followeth.

1. Whether the Scriptures containe sufficient doctrine for our saluation. The questiõs.
2. Whether faith onely iustifieth.

MAster Charke beganne the action with this godly prayer, but Campion refusing to pray with them, becrossed himselfe on the forehead, breastes, and other partes, after his superstitious maner.

Our helpe is in the name of the Lord, who hath made heauen and earth. O eternall God and most mercifull father, we thy seruantes doe humbly acknowledge, that we are by nature miserable sinners, ful of darkenesse and errour, without thee neither meete to receiue the loue, nor able to yeelde the obedience of thy trueth. Therefore wee beseech thee in Iesus Christ, to throw all our sinnes into the bottome of the sea, & to chase away all our darkenes with the brightnesse of thy wisedome, that we may growe vp in the knowledge, in the loue, and in the obedience of thy most holy will. And because we are here assembled to maintaine thy trueth against the errour and superstition of Antichrist, vouchsafe, O Lord our God, to be present in this action by thy holy spirit, and so sanctifie our hearts and gouerne our tongues, that our corrupt affections being suppressed, all things may be done in a godly zeale for thy trueth, and

nothing against it. Moreouer, for those that are come to heare, graunt that as many as loue thy Gospell, may be more and more confirmed in the knowledge thereof, by that which shalbe faithfully deliuered out of thy holy worde: such as be otherwise minded, wee pray thee that they may yeelde either to the manifest trueth, if they appertayne to thy holy election: or being none of thine, that they may appeare guyltie and conuicted of a lying spirite, such as is gone out into the worlde to deceyue those that will not receyue the loue of thy trueth, but delight in darkenesse. These things, O Lord, and whatsoeuer thou knowest to be good for vs, we aske in the name of Jesus Christ, and by that forme of prayer, which he hath taught vs. Our Father, &c.

After the prayer was ended, M. D. Walker entred with this preface.

Walker. Gentlemen, ye shal vnderstande, that we be sent hither by authoritie, to talke & conferre with one called Campion, an English man borne, and brought vp in this realme in schooles & places where good learning hath bene taught, so that he might haue bene a good instrument in this common wealth and Gods Church: but contrary to his bringing vp, his friendes expectation, & hope that this Church might haue conceaued of him, like an vnnaturall man to his countrey, degenerated from an English man, an Apostata in religion, a fugitiue from this realme, vnloyal to his Prince, hath not onely fled to the man of Rome, an aduersarie to Christ and his doctrine: but hath gotten a courage from that Romanist with certaine other his sectaries, to come into this realme againe, to vndermine the Gospell of Christ, to seduce Gods people, and withdrawe her Maiesties lawfull subiectes to disobedience and sedition, and hath bene (disguised in Ruffians apparel) in diuers places of this realme, to plant secretely that blasphemous Masse and other Poperie, whereunto it appeareth hee hath allured many vnstable fooles: and in Yorkeshire, where his Sectaries & disciples are apprehended & iustly imprisoned, nowe they rage (as I heare say) and curse him that euer he came there. So ye see what maner of mā we are to talke withal. What good we shall do with him, the Lord doeth knowe, other maner of men then we are, and of another calling, were more meete to talke with him then we: notwithstanding, we will doe our best that we can,

God

God giue it good effect. As for you, Campion, I heare say, that you vse to scoffe and iest at such as come to conferre with you: we come not for that purpose, it is not our profession, yet I giue you warning, *Si quam maledicendo cœperis voluptatem, eam male audiendo amittes.*

A prouerbial speach signifying thus much: If you take any pleasure in speaking euill, you shall lose it in hearing euill.

Now to the question, which is, that the scriptures containe all things sufficient to saluation, against the assertion of your booke: For you say that the Lutherans haue cut off many bookes from the body of the new Testament, and so diuided them from the Canonicall scripture, which is not true.

Camp. Yes that they haue, and therein they haue done euill.

Walker. Here Master Walker reade the words out of Campions challenge.

Campion. Luther hath cut off the Epistle of Iames, the second epistle of Iohn, Iude, and the seconde of Peter. Luther hath found fault with these, and improued them in his prefaces vpon those Epistles.

Walker. Luther hath not doubted of them himselfe, but shewed that others haue doubted of them.

Campion. It is one thing to doubt, an other thing to cut off. Bring me the bookes, and I will shewe that he hath cut them off.

Walker. That can not bee shewed, if the bookes were here: For the Doctors doe not agree, concerning these bookes that are of the Canon. Some recite more, & some recite lesse, as Origen, Hierome, and others, and yet it were hard to say, that they cut off any of the Canonicall bookes. They doe, as Luther may, shewe what bookes were doubted of in their time, and yet no whitte preiudice the bookes of the Canonicall Scripture.

Campion. Well, I say whatsoeuer they might doe then, yet now seeing the Church hath otherwise determined, it is blasphemie for any to doubt of them. The Lutherans doe doubt of them: bring me the bookes, and I will shewe where Luther doubteth, and therefore blasphemeth, because the Church hath taken away the doubt: videlicet, the third Councill of Carthage, and that of Laodicea.

Walker. I do not professe my selfe a Lutheran, but a Christian. But if olde fathers and olde Councils haue not receiued these bookes for Canonical and bookes to ground our faith vpon, then

can

can not new men, nor the Tridentine Council (being ful of errors) make thē Canonicall. Auguſt. de doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. ca. 8. leaueth out Baruch, & the two laſt bookes of Eſdras. Hieronymus præf. in li. Reg. *Hūc prologū galeatū principiū vocat.* He ſaith, *Igitur Sapientia quæ vulgo Salomonis inſcribitur, & Ieſu filij Syrach liber, & Iudith, & Tobias, & paſtor, nō ſunt in Canone. Macchabæorū primū librū Hebraicū reperi, ſecūdus Græcus eſt, quod ex ipſa phraſi probari poteſt.* Euſebius alſo *eccleſi. hiſt. lib. 6. cap. 18. fol. 368. & ſequentibus, omittit tertiū & quartū Eſdræ, Tobiæ, Iudith, Baruch, Sapiētiæ, Eccleſiaſtici, Machabæorum libros. Paulo poſt: De eo (inquit) qui eſt apud Hebræos nonnulli dubitauerunt. &c. Sed ego dico ſicut mihi à maioribus traditum eſt, quia manifeſtiſſimè Pauli eſt. Ibi de ſecunda Petri Epiſtola à nōnullis dubitatur. De duabus vltimis Iohannis Epiſtolis apud quoſdā dubia ſententia.* He omitteth in the forenamed place the third & fourth booke of Eſdras, the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Baruch, of Wiſdome, of Eccleſiaſticus, & of the Macchabees. A litle after: Cōcerning that (ſaith he) which is written to the Hebrues, many haue doubted: but I ſay as hath bene deliuered vnto mee from mine Elders, becauſe it appeareth moſt manifeſtly to be of Paules. There alſo, concerning the ſecond Epiſtle of Peter, he ſayth, that it was doubted of many: and ſo with ſome were the two laſt Epiſtles of Iohn. The ſame *Euſebius lib. 4. cap. 26. loquens de Melitone Epiſcopo Sardenſis Eccleſiæ, qui recitans volumina veteris Teſtamenti, omittit Eſdras, Tobi, Heſter, Iudith, Baruch, Sapientiæ, Syrach, Macchabæorum. &c.* Speaking of Melito the Biſhop of the Church of Sardis, who reckening vp the volumes of the olde Teſtament, he omitteth Eſdras, Tobie, Heſter, Iudith, Baruch, Wiſedome, Syrach, the bookes of the Macchabees, &c. And the Laodicean Councill omitteth Lukes Goſpel & the Apocalyps. You ſee therefore that theſe old fathers haue left theſe bookes out of the Canon, and yet were they neyther called heretiques, nor blaſphemers.

Campion. It is not lawfull to cut off the bookes of the olde Teſtament from the Canon: which not onely, as I haue ſayd, Luther hath done, but alſo Caluine. The one hath reiected thoſe bookes I haue named, and the other reiecteth the bookes of Tobie, Eccleſiaſticus, the booke of Wiſdome, the bookes of Maccabees, Baruch, and the like, which are *de ſyncero Canone.*

Walker.

Walker. What is this to that I haue saide? I haue shewed that the olde Doctors haue refused them for Canonicall, and therefore so many may we refuse: and they themselues will be no further admitted then they agree with the Canonicall Scriptures: and these bookes which you name, haue alwayes bin esteemed Apocrypha. Augustin. contra Maximinum Arrianorum Episcopum lib. 2. Cap. 14. *Nec ego Nicenum, nec tu debes Ariminense tanquam præiudicaturus proferre Concilium: nec ego huius authoritate, nec tu istius debueris: Scripturarum authoritatibus non quorumcumq; proprijs, sed vtrisq; communibus testibus, res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet &c.* August. against Maximinus the Bishop of the Arrians. Neither oughtest thou to bring the Council of Arimine, nor I the Nicene, as it were to preiudice the trueth: neither should I be holden with the authoritie of this, nor thou of that: but let it be tryed by the authoritie of the Scriptures, not the proper witnesses of any, but common to both, let matter with matter, cause with cause, and reason with reason trye it, &c. And Hierome writing to Læta de institutione filiæ, fol. 58. willeth, not to reade some without doubting, and other some warely: but he sayth, *Caueat omnia Apocrypha*, Let her beware of all the Apocrypha, (which hee nameth in Prologo Galeato.) *Et si quando ea non ad dogmatum veritatem, sed ad signorum reuerentiam legere voluerit, sciat non eorum esse quorum titulis prænotantur, multaquè ijs admixta vitiosa, & grandis esse prudentiæ aurum in luto quærere.* And if at any time shee will reade them, not for the trueth of opinions, but for the reuerence of signes, let her knowe that they are not theirs whose titles they beare, but that many vitious things are mixt with them, and that it is a point of great wisdome to seeke out golde in dirt. Loe, here you see that he biddes her to beware in the reading of them.

Campion. The Scripture is principally to be admitted: but I would we might haue an argument.

Walker. Then thus I reason.

That which hee biddeth to beware of, is not to be holden authenticall:

But he biddeth to beware of the Apocrypha:

Ergo the Apocrypha is not to be holden authenticall.

Camp. Apocrypha are taken two wayes. First, for those bookes which are doubted of: and then, for such bookes that are not allowed. Such were ỹ prophecie of Enoch, Iacobs testament and such like, which he calleth *Somniolenta deliramenta, vitiosa, &c.* of those Hierome speaketh in this place, and not of those others. For what point is there in Ecclesiasticus, the booke of Wisdome, that is to be found fault with ỹ is *vitiosū*, and not good?

Walker. They are called Apocrypha, that are not in the Canon receiued and allowed to haue proceeded vndoubtedly from the holy Ghost: these Apocrypha are forbidden to be read. And Hierome in præfat. in lib. Reg. saith, *Hic prologus scripturarum &c. Si quid extra hos est, inter Apocrypha est ponendum &c.* They are not in the Canon: therefore Apocrypha are onely to be read.

Campion. Would Hierome forbid ỹ gentlewoman to reade Ecclesiasticus, where there are giuen so many morall precepts? *Non sunt in Canone Hebræorum, sed in Canone Christianorum.* They are not in the Canon of the Hebrewes, but they are in the Canon of the Christians.

Walker. They may be read for morall Lessons, but not for matters of religion, which must bee proued by Canonicall scripture. What say you to the second booke of Macchabees? Thinke you that to be holden for Canonicall scripture?

Campion. I thinke so: What should let?

Walker. What say you to ỹ sentence 2. Maccha. 12. thrust into the text, *Salubris est oratio pro defunctis?* and to that which followeth? *Et si quidem benè, & vt historiæ competit, hoc est vt ipse velim, sin autem minus dignè, concedendum est mihi.* And if I haue done well, and as is meete for a storie, this also my selfe did wish, &c.

Camp. It is marueile that you shoulde say that it is thrust in.

Walker. It is noted so by other, and the duetie of an historiographer is to reporte things done truely and plainely, without arguing like a Logitian: but hee sayeth, *Ergo salubris est oratio pro defunctis,* Therefore prayer for the dead is healthfull, which appeareth first to haue beene set in the margent. But howe anoyde you the last? Can such asking of pardon be of the holy Ghost? wherein hath hee sayled? or of whom shall hee bee pardoned?

pardoned?

Camp. The interpreter asketh pardon of his speach for his style, and not for the doctrine. The holy Ghost asketh no more pardon, then Paul did when he sayde *Rudis sum sermone*, I am rude in speach, when he spake in a base and lowe stile.

Charke. Campion, howsoeuer you labour to auoyde the direct course of disputation, and haue obteined some change of the question, I must call you home by and by. Notwithstanding, I minde a while to followe this your course, and to finde you out in your owne trace: where I maruaile howe you dare thus speake in this assemblie. For what a blot is it to the holy Ghost, to affirme he should aske pardon? and to the Apostle Saint Paul, to say his stile to the Corinthians is a base and lowe stile? But to vse no further preface, I will thus proue that the second booke of the Macchabees was not indited by the holy Ghost.

Whatsoeuer needeth pardon either for matter or maner, was not indited by the holy Ghost: 1. Argum.

But the storie of the second booke of Macchabees needeth pardon, either for matter or maner:

Therefore it was not indited by the holy Ghost.

Camp. This man would be angrie with me, if he knew why.

Charke. If I would, knowe I not why to be angrie with you, a notable and vowed enemie of the trueth of God, and a seditious man against the state? But I come not to deale with your person, but against your errors: Answere the argument.

Camp. I say the writer of the Macchabees asketh pardon of his speach, neither doeth S. Paul blotte the holy Ghost when he sayd that he was *rudis sermone*, that he spake not so eloquently, nor so finely, as sometimes he might.

Charke. You answere not directly: and beside, you affirme an error. For S. Paul craueth no pardon for his stile, but setteth his plainesse against the set and curious speach of the false Apostles, who did come in gay apparance and shewe of wordes, as if they had had all the power of trueth that might be: & yet in this plaine style, the Apostle was of al others most mightie & most eloquent. As for the 2. booke of Macchabees, which you make Canonicall scripture, here I wil make this challenge (if you dare answere it) to proue many lyes in ỹ booke through ἀνωρθοσία, and that therefore Ignorance of the storie.

it was written by a prophane spirite for the matter. But to come to the Syllogisme, and to disproue your distinction, I reason thus.

The writers of holy Scriptures aske not any pardon at all, either for the matter or for the manner:

Therefore they aske no pardon for their stile.

Camp. I denie your Antecedent: Paul sayeth, *Rudis sum sermone.*

Charke. If Saint Paul saith *Rudis sum sermone*, doeth he (I pray you) in those wordes craue pardon for his stile? howe hang your wordes together? I wil proue my Antecedent by the place of Peter.

2. Pet. 1. 21.

None that haue written, as they were directed by the spirit of God, craue pardon either for matter or for manner:

But all the holy men of God that wrote the Scriptures, haue written as they were directed by the spirit of God:

Therefore none of the holy men of God, that haue written the Scriptures, craue pardon either for matter or manner.

Camp. This acknowledging of the weakenesse of his stile, is in the Apostle an humilitie comming from the holy Ghost.

Charke. You answere not to the Argument: therefore, to auoyde your cauil, consider the Syllogisme againe in this sort.

Whatsoeuer is the worde of God, is full, sound, and perfect, it doeth neither aske, nor neede pardon in any respect:

But the second booke of Maccabees, doeth both neede & aske pardon in some respect:

Therefore it is not the worde of God.

Here was a cómon good liking of this way.

Norton. If you will stay a while and speake leasurely, you shall haue the Argument written: and while it is writing, if you will haue any thing added or changed, it shall be done. It will be more profitable for the hearers, and greater ease for your selues.

Camp. With a good will. I answere: In it selfe and for it selfe it neither needeth nor asketh pardon, but for circumstance. In respect of daintie eares, it may aske pardon.

Charke. Why Campion, shall the holy Ghost begge pardon in respect of daintie eares?

Camp. Yes, Put this in also, that I say it was in respect of the stile, for the forme and the manner of it.

Norton. Well I haue put it in so.

Charke. Let him put in all his shiftes & helpes, clogging his answeres as much as he will, we will cast the clogges vpon his owne heeles: and thus I reason against all your cauils. Whatsoeuer is in the worde of God is all of the holy Ghost, both for matter, for stile, and for circumstance, and the holy Ghost asketh no pardon for any of these: Therfore the 2. booke of the Macchabees asking pardon is not of the holy Ghost, nor canonical scripture.

Campion did often adde & alter his answeres, while they were in writing.

Here Campion being hastie before Master Norton had written it through out, Master Norton willed him to stay a little. Campion replied, that it was losse of time. To which Master Norton answered againe, that it was a gaining of the time. He desired that the worde all might be inferred in the Antecedent.

Before he desired it, & now being straightned he disliketh it and counteth it losse of time.

Charke. I sayd, all.

Norton. So it is, and rightly set downe.

Camp. Then I answere thus. This circumstance, of asking pardon, is of the holy Ghost: for it is a speach of humilitie, proceeding from the holy Ghost, as is Saint Paules speach, *Rudis sum sermone*, I am rude in speach: *Et non in persuasibilibus verbis humanæ sapientiæ.* Not in the perswasible wordes of mans wisedome.

Charke. *Rudis sum sermone* commeth oft and rudely in: and yet the alledging of it hath bene disproued long ago. Neuertheless seeing it pleaseth you so wel, it shalbe a weapon of your own giuing, to vse against your selfe. For the Apostle, of purpose auoyding the wisdome of mans eloquence, doth iustifie that which his aduersaries called rudenesse of speach, as lawfull and good. Neither doth he (as you imagin) confesse any want, or craue pardon. Therefore your example is false, deceitfull, and vnlearned. It is a trim thing for you to abuse the multitude vnder opinion of great learning, and to match those that are no scriptures with scriptures, sometime affirming one thing, and another time another: sometime that the Apostles speach is rude and the stile base, and needeth pardon in respect of daintie eares: and now last that it needeth no pardon, but is done for humilitie: whereas the holy Ghost neuer asketh pardon of man for any thing he doth: for that were to bring God vnder man, and make the spirit of God subiect to the allowance or disallowance of sinfull flesh.

Camp. I answere, that neither this of the Macchabees, nor Pauls speach hath neede of pardon in it selfe.

Charke. It is too too much & absurd to accuse the holy ghost of waste and needles speach. For if there needed no pardon, it was not according to the holy Ghost to craue it.

Camp. I haue sayd, neither this nor the Apostles speach needed any pardon in it selfe, and yet it was not waste and needlesse, because it proceeded of humilitie.

Charke. Will you charge the holy Ghost with dissimulation? speaketh he one thing, and meaneth another?

Camp. I say it was not waste, because it proceeded of humilitie, to craue pardon.

Charke. Wel, I proue my assertion against this your imagined humilitie of the holy Ghost to sinfull flesh.

Whatsoeuer is without cause is waste and needlesse:

But your self confesse it to be without cause for the holy Ghost to craue pardon:

Therefore by your owne confession it is waste and needlesse.

Camp. I denie the Minor. For there is cause: for in trueth the stile is simple.

The aduersary against himselfe, and yet turned from all his shifts.

Charke. Howe often haue you granted the Minor, saying, he needed not to aske pardon? and nowe (as forgetting your selfe) you say there is cause of asking pardon: For (you say) in trueth the stile is simple. Your speaches are contradictorie. Set it downe that the aduersarie is not at one with him selfe. Besides, he was driuen before to grant the stile is not base or simple.

Camp. I haue set downe no contrarietie, but in respect.

Charke. In respect, is a simple shift. Are not these contradictory propositions? He needeth not pardon, but asketh it in humilitie: and, He needeth pardon, for in trueth the stile is simple.

Camp. I pray you reade the place of the Maccabees.

In English. If so be I haue done wel, & as agreeth with a storie, this I do desire: if not so worthily, it must be pardoned in me.

Charke. Thus you retire: and aske moreouer that which needeth not. For the place is well knowen, and was read before. But I wil reade it againe. *Et si quidem benè, & vt historiæ competit, hoc & ipse velim: si autem minus dignè, concedendum est mihi.* This I would haue all the companie marke and vnderstand, whom you labor with indirect speaches to abuse & draw from the trueth, that whether the authour of this booke excuse himself & craue pardon

in these wordes for his stile, or for his storie, neither can be of the holy ghost: because (as hath bene proued at large) the holy ghost faileth nothing at all in any point of speache, of matter, or of circumstance. Thus your distinctions and cause fall together.

Camp. I haue answered you in what respect he craueth pardon, and if that cannot satisfie you, leaue it to God and this companie to iudge of.

Charke. Sure your satisfaction is very weake: farre from satisfying God that hateth such fond distinctions to darkē his word, or those of the company that seeke to be edified. But you giue me new occasion to prosecute this matter. What thinke you therefore of the storie of Iudith, touching the dressing and derking of her selfe with apparell and ornaments fittest to deceiue Holofernes eies: and what say you to her lies and prayer that he might be taken with the snare of his eies looking vpon her: the speaches vntrue, and the action vnchaste in outward apparance, were they (thinke you) of the holy Ghost?

Iudith 10.3,4. Iudith 10.vers. 12,13.& 11.19. and 12.14. Iud.9.vers.10.

Camp. I maruell not that you so speake of me, when you so speake of a blessed woman, to bring so holy an action into doubt. Surely you greatly offend me in so doing.

Charke. I speake of ỹ wordes and storie as it is plainely written, she prayeth, saying, *Capiatur laqueo oculorum suorum in me, & percuties eum ex labijs charitatis meæ.* And againe, *Verte sermonem meum in fraudem.* Doe you thinke this speache proceeded of the holy Ghost? Nay rather (howsoeuer it displease you to heare of the matter) it proceeded frō a prophane spirit, as I haue said, to charge the holy ghost with fraud, & to pray for such an effect, that Holofernes might be taken wᵗʰ her loue, & snared with her kisses.

Let him be taken with the snare of his eyes set on me: and smite him with the lippes of my loue. Turne my speach into fraude.

Campion. There be no such wordes in the booke.

Charke. Here you are manifestly ouertaken: for they are worde for worde in the 9. Chapter: and after your translations, the vulgar, and Vatablus.

Campion. Is that to be esteemed fraud, which the holy ghost deuiseth? Is it fraud to deceiue the deuill? blame you her, who did that she did to a good end, and for the deliuerie of the Church?

By Campions doctrine, no practise is vnlawfull, so it be for the deliuerie of their Church.

Char. What dealing is this? Euen now he denied the words: now finding them strong against his cause, he would auoide them with a distinction of good intents, to iustifie bad parts. Thus you

Papists

Rom.3.8. Papists hold against the word of God, that we may do euill that good may come of it. No Campion, Gods spirit is alwayes like it selfe: it is not agreeing with the maiestie of the spirit of God, for any woman to pray that a stranger shoulde be taken with the snare of his eyes looking vpō her: or that she may deceiue by lies. This story therfore & this practise proceeded not frō ỹ holy ghost.

Camp. It is a shame for you to bring that example. She desireth God, that it will please him to turne the wickednes of Holofernes to the deliuerie of his people. Shee prayeth not (as you say) that he should sinne.

Charke. She doth pray for it in plaine words, and set out her selfe in sumptuous apparell and ornaments to that purpose. It is a shame for you Campion to mainteine any such absurditie, & againe to deny and misconster the manifest wordes of that you would haue Canonicall scripture. We stand before ỹ face of God for the maintenance of his trueth, & giue such honour thereunto, that we acknowledge with our harts, & cōfesse with our mouths, that it is perfect, full, and sufficient, and that there is no prophanation in it: but you woulde haue that to bee matched with holy scripture, which is far vnworthy that honor. What say you to the argument & the place? Let him be takē with the snare of his eies in me, & turne my speach into deceit or fraude. This is a prayer for successe in a matter of sinne, most vnseemely for ỹ holy ghost.

Camp. I receiue this booke, first because the Nicene councill hath allowed it: then I say further, ỹ this was her meaning, that whereas God had giuē Holofernes ouer to fleshly lust, ỹ he might be taken with ỹ loue of his eyes towards her, to be besotted with her, ỹ she might the better perfourme her determinate purpose: she prayeth that God will turne his sinne to ỹ deliuerie of his distressed people. And what doth she commit worthy of blame in this?

Moreouer Iudith doth praise that act which the holy ghost doth flatly condēne *vide* Iud.9.2.& gen.49.5.&c. Iob 13.7.

Charke. This is not only worthy of blame, but also to be cōdemned as sinfull, and sauouring of a prophane spirite, that shee prayeth God to blesse her lyes and falshood, her tentations and allurements to lust. For the Lord hath appointed good wayes for good purposes, and for the performance of ỹ his worke he needed not her deceit. For (as Iob saith) God needeth not any mans lie, or any mans fraude. Which is also true of the fraude and dangerous allurements mentioned in that chapter.

Camp.

Camp. What Chapter? what Chapter?

Camp. knoweth not his owne translation.

Charke. The ninth Chapter. Reade and acknowledge the woꝛds you haue denyed. Here Campion read in his owne booke, saying he perceiued we builded vpon our owne translation.

Camp. Well, this is mine answere. It was not truely and foꝛmally fraude, but materially in the foꝛmall act fraude: as foꝛ example, when the people of the Iewes were commanded to steale from the Egyptians, it was in the act theft, but not foꝛmally theft. So Abꝛahams intent to kill his childe, was to do murther in the act, but foꝛmally it was no murther.

Charke. You woulde nowe in steade of a shoꝛt and schoole-like answere dꝛawe me to a παράγγον, from the place in hande to the examination of newe matters. Theꝛefoꝛe to take you where you will needes be, I say the Hebꝛewe woꝛde hath not that signification that it shoulde impoꝛt theft, but a spoyle, which was iust and commanded of God, as after a victoꝛie, oꝛ foꝛ a rewarde of their labours and seruice in Egypt: theꝛefoꝛe no theft. But this fraude is another thing. So ꝑ first example is vnlike & pꝛoueth nothing: no moꝛe do the rest. Foꝛ Abꝛahams act was no murther, noꝛ intent of murther, but a duetifull obedience and seruice to God who had expꝛessly commanded it. Lastly, you can not thinke ꝑ the Magistrate in taking the life of a transgꝛessoꝛ, oꝛ taking away ꝑ head of a tꝛaytoꝛ, is a murtherer. No, this duetie of iustice is layd vpon him by his office from God, and can not but ignoꝛantly be called murther. And such was the warrant foꝛ Abꝛaham in his office.

Campion. I meane killing, as it respecteth the taking away of life and no otherwise.

Charke. How do you confound the special with the general? All murther is the taking away of life, but all taking away of life is not murther. To kill and to take away life from the wicked by the swoꝛde of iustice is iust, and in no respect to carry the name of murther, which is euermoꝛe euill.

Walker. *Concilium Laodicenum*, The Councill of Laodicea hath left out Tobi, Iudith, the booke of Wisdome, Ecclus, Baruch, Maccabees, Esra the third and fourth, and in the new Testament Luke & the Apocalyps, these are the woꝛdes: *Quæ autem oporteat legi & in authoritatem recipi hæc sunt, Geneſis, Exodus, &c.* But those which ought to be read & receiued foꝛ authentical are these,

Geneſis, Exodus,&c. where the foꝛenamed bookes are omitted.

Camp. The Laodicene Council, was particular and not generall. And againe, it reckeneth vp thoſe bookes ꝑ were vndouted, & not douted of in ꝑ part of ꝑ woꝛld. But what maketh this to pꝛoue ꝑ they were douted of, of ꝑ Catholike Church? They were douted of in ꝑ Church, oꝛ in ꝑ part of the Church, Ergo they were douted of, of the whole Church. How holdeth this? Therefoꝛe it is plaine ꝑ theſe bookes were not douted of in ꝑ whole Church. Foꝛ the ſame Nicene Council accepteth Iudeth, as Hierome teſtifieth in the pꝛeface to Iudeth. Further, becauſe the Church of Rome appꝛoueth them, it followeth not that we ſhould dout of them.

Walker. Then you confeſſe, that ꝑ Councill ſet not downe al that we ſhould receiue. And where you make the Councill particular, it was pꝛouinciall: and further, was confirmed by the ſixth general Councill holden at Trullo, Conſtantine being pꝛeſident, as Bartholomæus Caranza wꝛiteth fol. 71. & therfoꝛe we may w̃ them leaue out of the Canon, Tobie, Iudeth, the booke of Wiſedome, Eccleſiaſticus, Maccabees, &c. which your Councill of Trent thruſt in as authenticall. But to leaue that, it is plaine, that Cyprian vpõ the Creede omitteth al ꝑ Apocrypha, hauing rehearſed thoſe which be Canonicall, he ſayth, *Hæc ſunt quæ patres intra Canonem concluſerunt, ex quibus fidei noſtræ aſſertiones conſtare voluerunt. Sciendum tamen eſt, quod & alij libri ſunt, qui non Canonici ſed Eccleſiaſtici a maioribus appellati ſunt, vt eſt Sapientia Salomonis, Eccleſiaſticus libellus, Tobiæ & Iudith, & Machabæorum libri, quæ omnia in eccleſijs legi voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad autoritatem ex iis fidei confirmandam,* Theſe are thoſe thinges which the fathers ſhut within the Canon, by which they woulde haue the aſſertions of our faith to ſtand. Notwithſtanding wee muſt know that there are other bookes alſo, which of our Elders were called Eccleſiaſt. and not Canonicall, as Salomons booke of Wiſd. Ecclus. the bookes of Tobias, Iudeth, & the Macca. all which they would haue read in the church, and yet not brought foorth, to confirme the authoritie of faith out of them.

Camp. He is called cõmonly *Author expoſitionis in Symbolum,* and therefoꝛe doubtful whether it were Cyprian oꝛ no: but admit it were, I anſwere to theſe and al ſuch like places, that when particular Fathers, & particular Councils doe recken vp ſuch & ſuch bookes,

bookes,& omit others ỳ either were receiued there or in other places sithens,they recken vp such as were then come to their knowledge,and such as were approued in that part of the world,where they then liued.But it followeth not,they reckened no more,Ergo there were no more. They doubted, therefore we must acknowledge no more.For the Church hath since put them out of doubt.

Walker. You answere not, but trifle: For those are not onely omitted and left vnreckoned, but they are set downe for Apocrypha or Ecclesiastici,& so certainely named, and not canonical.

Camp. Some might be set downe then as doubtfull, that nowe are out of doubt,because they are receiued.

Charke. Hitherto you haue gone from the matter:wherein I haue bene willing to followe you a little, to cleare the point that then was in hand when I began with you. Nowe let vs come to the questions agreed of betweene vs.

Camp. May let vs first speake of the authoritie of the Scripture,then(if you will)of the sufficiencie.

Charke. Of the authoritie we haue spoken already, and it is not within our question,which is onely of sufficiencie.

Camp. I deferre to the scriptures all authoritie, and all sufficiencie: therefore you haue nothing against me.

Charke. Yes,I haue this against you,that you doe not thinke the scriptures onely and alone sufficient to all doctrine of fayth and maners.For whatsoeuer you say, we knowe you holde and teache the contrarie:namely that all things are not set downe and written in the worde. This other day you were still calling for Syllogismes,and when you had receiued a blowe, and stood astonied vnder it, yet you cryed out, a Syllogisme, a Syllogisme, to make men beleeue that you were not touched. Nowe you shall haue Syllogismes: answere to them directly and shortly. Thus I proue the sufficiencie of the scripture without traditions.

Argu. 1. Prouing that the scriptures conteine sufficient doctrine to saluation.

What the Apostles taught *viua voce*, by liuely voyce,that also they wrote:

But they taught *viua voce*,whatsoeuer is necessary to saluatiõ:

Therefore they wrote also whatsoeuer is necessary to saluatiõ.

Camp. *Nego argumentum*,I denie the Argument.

Charke. It is a Syllogisme, you would haue denied my Maior,I thinke.

Camp. Proue your Maior then.

Charke. What care they had ouer the Churches present, the same care they had ouer the Churches to come afterwarde: But their care ouer the Churches present, was to open to them all the counsell of God:

Therefore they left the like prouision in writing to all posteritie, that they might be instructed in all the counsell of God.

Camp. I answere to the Maior. They had the same care, but in such sort as it was expedient. It was not expedient that they should write all and euery sillable that they spake: and yet notwithstanding they disclosed all the counsell of God, either in speciall or generall wordes written.

Charke. Very wel, then we are come to the issue of the matter, and you graunt the question, that all doctrine both concerning faith and maners, is either in speciall or generall wordes conteined in the Scripture.

Camp. I agree. But heare mine answere out of S. Augustine against Cresconius. Where it can not be aduouched in scripture by speciall words that the baptisme of heretikes is good, yet it is deliuered in the scripture by generall wordes, forasmuch as the scripture doeth command vs to obey the Church which hath allowed this baptisme being conferred *in forma Ecclesiæ*: so the doctrines not particularly discoursed in scriptures are yet conteined in these wordes, Obey your prelates. The Church is the pillar and supporter of trueth. And if he heare not the Church, let him be to thee an Ethnike and Publicane.

In the forme or maner of the Church.

Charke. You say particular matters are conteined in those generall wordes, Obey your Prelates. Doe you meane that we must obey them in causes not conteined in the worde? Then you may binde vs to what you list, & disalowe what ye please. Therefore, syr, that I may seeke your corners and finde you out, what meane you by this when you say that Generall commandements allowe particular traditions?

Camp. I named not traditions.

Charke. But it is the effect and scope of your speach for obedience to your Church Prelates, in matters not expressed in the Scriptures.

Camp. I say there be poyntes wherein we accorde with you,

as

as the baptisme of heretiques, the baptisme of infants, the holy Ghost proceeding from the father and the sonne, that baptisme is a Sacrament and Preaching is none, being both commanded at one time, that the Eucharist is a Sacrament and washing of feete none, being commanded at one time: and such like.

Charke. To say that the proceeding of the holy Ghost from the Father & the Sonne is not expressed in the scripture, is a blasphemous speach.

Camp. Shew me any sentence expressing it in the scripture.

Charke. It sufficeth to shewe it inferred in the scripture by good proofes of consequence & implication. But what say you to traditions, decrees and such like, which the Church of Rome maintaineth as the very Word it selfe? Let vs speake of them being now in question, and not breake out into newe matters not in controuersie.

Camp. I will not go from my question.

Charke. You shall come to it, if you take vpon you the defence of your traditions, which I disproue in this maner.

If the Apostles left nothing vnwritten that is necessarie to salvation, the scriptures are sufficient: Argu. 2.

But the Apostles haue left nothing vnwritten necessarie to salvation:

Therefore the Scriptures are sufficient.

Campion. I graunt it as before, referring it to the Church, and supposing alwayes a true Church. I pray you of what Church are you?

Charke. We talke of the true Church, and therefore this question is needles. Are we to obey any thing contrary to the worde of God? You can imagine nothing left to the Church, that is not manifestly conteined in the scripture.

Camp. Call you manifestly particularly?

Charke. To what purpose is that question? I must bring you to a Syllogisme, lest you auoyde disputation by digressing into other matter.

If any thing be left obscure or not fully handled by the Apostles, it was either because the Apostles could not, or because they would not write manifestly and fully:

But it is a blasphemie to say they could not, and it is false to

say they would not:

Therefore they haue written all, manifestly and fully.

Here Campion repeated the Argument, and then sayd thus:

Camp. I answere to the worde manifestly: either in generall or particular termes manifest, and this the Apostles both could and would. For this is manifest enough, Beleeue the Church: but it is not particular.

Charke. While we dispute of the manifest and full contents of the scripture, leaue to choppe in the needles terme Particular: manifest generals do include particulars. And where, I pray you, are we commanded to beleeue the Church in matters not contained in the written worde? By this vncertaine rule you may warrant all former traditions, and bring in any newe absurdities.

Camp. That is not the question.

Charke. But it is a necessary note for the confutation of your answeres and doctrine of vnwritten verities. Therefore I thus proue against you.

To leaue a doore open to any changeable or doubtfull traditions, is not to teache things manifest enough in the scriptures:

But to send vs to your Church prelates in matters not expressed in the written worde, is to leaue a doore open to chaungeable and doubtfull traditions:

Therefore to send vs to your Church prelates in matters not expressed in the written worde, is not to teach things manifest enough in the scriptures.

Camp. To leaue a doore to traditions, which the holy Ghost may deliuer to the true Church, is both manifest and sure: as the baptisme of Infants, the holy Ghost proceeding from Father and Sonne, and such other things mentioned, which are deliuered by tradition. Proue these directly by the scripture.

Charke. Which proposition in the Syllogisme doe you denie?

Camp. Proue the baptisme of children and the proceeding of the holy Ghost, not to be traditions.

Charke. I maruaile you thus auoyde the Syllogisme, and what you meane to match doctrines contained in ỹ word of God with vnwritten and vncertaine traditions of men. It is plaine, that the baptisme of children is proued by the analogie of Circumcision with baptisme, children being circumcised ỹ eight day.

Rom.4.11.
Colos.2.11,12.
Gen.17.12.

Also

Also by that the Sacraments of the old Testament, are the same with the Sacraments of the newe. The proceeding of the holy ghost is euidently proued by this that our Sauiour promiseth to send the holy Ghost. 1.Cor.10.1. Luke 22.49. Iohn 15.26.

Camp. Proue the proceeding of the holy ghost *Ex parte filii*: That is on the sonnes part: For that is the point.

Charke. It is proued by my former words, and where Christ breathed vpon his disciples and said, Receiue the holy ghost. Iohn 2.22.

Camp. Well, leaue that & talke of baptisme, which this company vnderstandeth better. Suppose that I am an Anabaptist: And ỹ Anabaptist denieth this argument, because children should not be baptized till the eight day, & the scripture willeth them to be baptized that beleeue: so that first they must haue Faith, or els they may not be baptized. Campion was readier to moue 2. new matters, then to answere one argumẽt.

Charke I replye to you, that Infidels, of age to vnderstande and beleeue, must beleeue before they be baptised and admitted to the Church: but the children of beleeuers being the seede of the faithfull, they may receiue the seale of the couenant of God made to the Fathers & to their seede, according to that of the Apostle, If the first fruites be holy, the lumpe also: If the roote be holy, the branches also are holy. Rom.11.6. But to ỹ question. Notwithstanding the scriptures be the only rule & triall of all questions in religion, and do fully proue ỹ matter in hand: yet (because you will not be cõtented without thẽ) answere a place or two out of ỹ Doctors. Eusebius lib.3. cap.35. of his ecclesiasticall storie writeth, that Ignatius being caried prisoner to Rome, did exhort the Churches to cleaue vnseparably to the tradition (that is, to ỹ deliuered doctrine of the Apostles) which for safetie it was necessarie to put downe in writing, that we might not depart frõ it. Which excludeth the generall bringing in of vnwritten verities vnder the colour of that text, Obey your prelates.

Campion. Reade the place.

Charke. Προὔτρεπε τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἔχεσθαι τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως, ἣν ἀσφαλείας χάριν ἐγγράφως ἤδη μαρτυρόμενος διατυποῦσθαι ἀναγκαῖον ἡγεῖτο. In English thus: He exhorted the Churches to cleaue vnseparable to the tradition of the Apostles, which hee supposed and testified nowe for safeties sake necessarily to haue beene set downe euen in writing.

Camp.

Camp. What woꝛdes do you inferre? Tradition I graunt is not alwayes taken foꝛ vnwꝛitten veritie. This place maketh foꝛ thoſe traditions which were not then wꝛitten. Ignatius was S. Iohns ſcholler, and he was *Oculatus teſtis*, An eye witneſſe of things that were not then wꝛitten, but went from hand to hand, and therefoꝛe hee thought it neceſſarie to leaue in wꝛiting ſuch trueth as he had heard and was not wꝛitten befoꝛe. Foꝛ the Goſpels were not then wꝛitten, & Ignatius wꝛote no Goſpel, and the text noteth that the things whereof hee ſpake, were ſuch as himſelfe wꝛote.

Charke. You miſtake the meaning of the place. Foꝛ Ignatius ſpake not of your doubtfull and multiplied traditions, but of the certaine Tradition, that is, of the deliuered and wꝛitten doctrine of the Apoſtles, to the which we muſt cleaue ἀκριβῶς, that is, ſo ſtedfaſtly that no foꝛce, no arte may cut vs off, oꝛ withdꝛawe vs from it: no not an Angell from heauen, much leſſe any moꝛtall man, howſoeuer magnified with the high titles of Popedome, oꝛ Pꝛelacie, oꝛ Apoſtolicall authoꝛitie.

Walker. You haue graunted that al things are wꝛitten in the woꝛd, and that ſuch traditions as can not manifeſtly be gathered out of the Canonical Scriptures, are not to be receaued. Thereupon I reaſon thus.

The ſame that the Apoſtles wꝛote, the ſame they deliuered in tradition:

But they haue wꝛitten and deliuered the ſame things that they read in the Canonicall ſcripture:

Ergo Their wꝛitings and traditions be all one and the ſame.

Camp. The ſame, that is to ſay, nothing contrarie.

Walker. The ſame and no other is needefull to ſaluation. Heare the Apoſtles woꝛds. 1. Cor. 4. *Hac de cauſa miſi vobis Timotheum, qui eſt filius meus dilectus, & fidelis in domino, qui vobis in memoriam reducet vias meas quæ ſunt in Chriſto, quemadmodum in omni eccleſia doceo.* Who is my beloued ſonne and faithfull in the Lord, who wil put you in mind of my waies which are in the Lorde, euen as I teache euery where in euery Church. That hee wꝛote and taught in one Church, he wꝛote and taught in another, and therfoꝛe 2. Cor. 1. he ſaith, *Nam gloriatio noſtra eſt teſtimonium conſcientiæ noſtræ, &c. Non enim alia ſcribimus vobis, quam quæ legitis*

gitis & agnoſcitis. For this is our glorie, euen the teſtimonie of our conſcience, &c. For we write no other things vnto you, thē which you reade and knowe in deede. Againe, 2. Cor. 2. *Quales ſumus ſermone per epiſtolas cum abſumus, tales ſumus & cum adſumus, facto.* The ſame that we are in ſpeach by our Epiſtles, when we are abſent, ſuch we are alſo when we are preſent.

Camp. The ſame, no contrarietie. For there were afterwards many ſcriptures that were not then witten. Howe therefore coulde they teach all thinges? This Epiſtle was not then witten, and diuers others. The meaning is, they taught one Faith, one Chriſt, one doctrine: but he ſpeaketh not of the Scriptures.

Walker. He taught the ſame thinges that Moſes and the Prophets taught. *Quales ſumus ſermone per Epiſtolas, tales & facto.*

Camp. I graunt the ſame teſtimonies out of Moſes and the Prophets: and Paul was as ſtout in ſpeaking as in doing. But what proueth this againſt me? For he ſaide more then he wrote.

Walker. He ſaid no more then is witten in the Scripture.

Camp. It is true that the Apoſtles proued all that they preached out of the Scriptures, out of the Law and the Prophets, and thereby iuſtified their preaching: and yet that part of the newe Teſtament which was afterwards witten, was not ſuperfluous: therefore ſufficiencie employeth not that it muſt be expreſſed, but that it may be gathered.

If the Apoſtles proued all by Scripture (as Campion graunteth) why ſhould not all others do the like?

Walker. You are one abſent, & another preſent. You woulde bring in Idolatrie vnder the name of your traditions: but I ſhewe you, that whatſoeuer we are to receiue, it muſt be in ꝑ ſcripture.

Camp. Theſe are but woordes, they neede no anſwere.

Walker. Wel, I will vrge you with matter out of Ambroſe, 1. Cor. 4. Super verba, regnetis vt & nos vobiſcum regnemus: *Quicquid ab Apoſtolis traditum non eſt, ſceleribus plenū eſt.* Whatſoeuer is not taught and deliuered by the Apoſtles, is ful of wickedneſſe.

Camp. He diſputes againſt falſe Apoſtles, and by waye of compariſon he ſeuereth the traditions of Catholiques, from thoſe of Heretikes: and this he doeth to ſhewe the difference of traditions, and not to condemne traditions.

Walker. It is an vniuerſall propoſition, that all traditions

that came not from the Apostles are full of wickednes: but those which they wrote came not from them. Ambrose also lib. 3. de virginibus: *Nos noua omnia quæ Christus non docuit, iure damnamus, quia fidelibus via Christus est. Si igitur Christus non docuit quod docemus, etiam nos id detestabile iudicamus.* We doe iustly condemne all new things which Christ hath not taught, because Christ is the way vnto the faithfull. If therefore Christ hath not taught that which we teache, wee also doe iudge that to bee most detestable.

Campion. This is against false prophetes, whereof there were many that then went abrode from place to place, teaching many things vnder the names of the Apostles that were none of theirs.

Walker. Very well. So there are things taught by you vnder their names, which are none of theirs: wherefore, we may conclude you to be in the number of false prophetes. Christ saith, Iohn 15. *Omnia quæ audiui a patre meo, nota feci vobis.* I haue shewed all things to you which I haue heard of my father. He shewed all thinges necessarie to saluation: and therefore this is the conclusion, Iohn. 20. *Hæc scripta sunt vt vitam habeatis: ideo vita consistit in ijs quæ scripta sunt.* These things are written that ye might haue life: therefore life consisteth in those things which are written. Tertullian *de præscriptionibus Hæreticorum: Apostolos enim domini habemus authores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio quod inducerent eligerunt, sed acceptam à Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus assignauerunt. Itaque etiamsi Angelus de cœlis aliter euangelizaret &c.* We haue the Apostles for our authors, who neither themselues chose any thing that they brought in of their owne brayne, but they faithfully assigned that discipline which they had receiued from Christ to the nations. Therefore, albeit an Angell should preach otherwise from heauen, &c.

Campion. Christ did teach all, and therefore the Apostles witte all that Christ taught? *Nego argumentum.* I deny the argument.

Walker. Why, *Hæc scripta sunt vt vitam habeamus:* These things are written, that wee may haue life: what neede wee more?

Campion. Enough is written, but in such sorte as was sayd before, either in generall wordes or speciall: either discoursed, or touched.

Walker. Although as the Euangelist saith, Iohn 21. *Multa alia fecit Iesus in conspectu discipulorum suorum, quæ non sunt scripta in hoc libro.* Iesus did many other things in the sight of his disciples which are not written in this booke: as true it is, hee wrought many miracles before his death, to declare himselfe to be the sonne of God, and after his resurrection to declare that he had a true bodie, which both did suffer, and was raysed vp agayne. And Luke Act. 1. sayth, *Scripsi tibi Theophile de omnibus quæ Christus tum fecit, tum docuit.* I haue written vnto thee o Theophilus concerning all things which Christ both hath done & hath taught, He saith, *De omnibus, non singulis.* For then if euery particular worde and act of Christ had bene written, the worlde could not haue receiued the volumes of bookes that should haue bene written, Iohn 2. 5, 9. But these things are written. Iohn. 20. 9. that ye might beleeue, and in beleeuing haue eternall life. Wherefore, *Scrutamini scripturas, quia in ijs, non alibi vita quærenda.* Iohn. 5. Searche the scriptures, because in them is life, and not els where to be sought.

Charke. This you haue beene inforced to graunt, that all thinges necessarie to saluation, are contained manifestly in the Scriptures.

Campion. I graunt it with my distinction: they are either manifestly written, or conteined vnder that generall commaundement, Obey your prelates.

Charke. To proue, that whatsoeuer you teache, ought to bee in the written worde of G O D, I haue a plaine place out of Tertullian against Hermogenes, which also maketh strongly against you. His wordes are these. *Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina: si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adijcientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum.* Let Hermogenes schole shewe that it is written: if it be not written, let him feare that curse appointed for them, which adde or take from the scriptures.

Campion. Where, say you, is this place of Tertullian?

Charke. In his booke *aduersus Hermogenem.*

Camp. *Aduersus Hermogenem?* I thinke ye are deceiued:

there is no such booke in Tertullian.

Charke. I do not onely thinke, but knowe of a certaintie that you are deceiued, and will shewe you the booke.

Campion. Note this obiection. This is mine answere to it. Hermogenes the Heretike did alleadge a bastard tradition, and Tertullian doth call him to proue his opinio by true Scriptures. For Tertullians argument is not to say, It is not written, Therefore it is not true: but to call him to proue the Scripture true, which he alledged for him.

Charke. And note this answere. He that euen now knewe no such booke, taketh presently vpon him to discourse of the argument thereof. What great boldnes is this? From what present reuelation doth it come? Beside your boldnes, your error is great, in affirming that Hermogenes brought a bastard tradition: for there is no such thing, as may appeare to any man that for triall hereof will reade ỳ booke. Hermogenes is cõfuted for saying as an Aristotelian Philosopher, ỳ God made al things of *materia prima*. Againe, of your answere I conclude, that of necessitie the proofe of euery particular tradition must be by a true scripture. And it is θετικὸν, a generall position: Tertullian would haue Hermogenes proue all that he helde by scripture.

Camp. I say it is not to shewe a bastard writing for his tradition, but that which is true scripture.

Charke. And that is all I aske: for what do I seeke more, but to proue that euery tradition must be proued by true Scripture? when therefore you Iesuites bring in vnwritten traditions concerning your Candles, your vnholy graines, your Agnus deis and such beggerly stuffe wherewith you abuse and pester the world, Tertullian saith, you bring a Væ vpon your selues, except you can proue the vse of them by Scriptures.

Campion. Why, I say it must needes be proued there, or els it is not to be receaued.

Charke. Remember what you graunt: I aske no more. To leaue Tertullian with you, to aduise better of: I alledge also a place of Basill out of his treatises called δοκιμικὰ, capite Περὶ πίστεως. This place doth clerely establish the sufficiencie of scripture, and banisheth all vnwritten and selfe will worshippings. Consider the place, for it is worthy of consideration, as making against you in this

this question: and charging you with pride and apostasie, for bringing in things not written.

Camp. Well, let these your speaches passe: Reade the place. S. Basill is not against vs.

Charke. Φανερὰ ἐκπτωσις πίστεως, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία ἡ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων, ἢ εἰσάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰπόντος, τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς ἀκούει. &c. It is a manifest Apostasie or falling away from the faith, and a fault of high pride, either to disallowe any thing written in the Scriptures, or to bring in any thing not written: seeing the Lord hath sayd, My sheepe heare my voyce. &c. with other arguments to that purpose.

Camp. I will not trouble the auditorie with this place. For Basill declareth that in some thinges we must be referred to tradition, he speaketh onely for the alleadging of false scriptures, and hath nothing against me.

Charke. Then nothing can make against errour, if this make not against you. But you abuse the auditorie, and knowe not the drift of Basill in this place, and that I will make euident to all the companie. Take the booke and reade it if you can, the place is easie Greeke, and the sentence but short.

Camp. I had rather reade it in Latine then in Greeke: I vnderstande the Latine better. I marueil you are so much in your Greeke.

Charke. If I shoulde not haue brought it in Greeke but in Latine, then you woulde haue taken exception against the interpreter. I bring not the interpretour, but Basill himselfe in the tongue wherein hee wrote. Here Campion being long in turning the Latine booke, coulde not finde the treatise, but desired Master Charke to finde it, who answered, I haue it readie in Basill himselfe. If you flee to the interpretour, turne your owne booke.

Campion. I haue answered you. Saint Basils meaning is, as it was then, a common doctrine: that it is a great fault to disalow true scriptures, or to bring in false scriptures: and to father a false writing vpon the Apostles.

Charke. I protest, that hauing perused the circumstances of the place, I finde no such generall or particular drifte of the fa-

ther, as you misreport: but a playne doctrine and sundrie argumentes to proue it, that nothing is to be receiued or brought into the Church, that is not written.

Camp. Your protestation is no argument. I am acquaynted with this dealing since the other day. But the scope of Saint Basill is as I haue saide.

Charke. My true protestation doeth ouerway your misconstruing, as wel of Basill nowe, as of Tertullian before, and therein I referre my selfe to the examination of both places. If you will or can reade but twenty lines further, your owne eies shal see and giue sentence against your selfe.

Camp. I haue giuen you the sense of the Doctours wordes, and neede not reade the place.

Charke. Reade first, and then answere. What Authour, or what place can make against you, if you will of your selfe frame an interpretation for your owne purpose, without reading the wordes, or making conscience what construction you giue?

Campion. Saint Basill in other places is of a contrary iudgement: and I am sure he is not contrary to him selfe. The Apostles had fayth before they wrote, and therefore it must needes be the scope.

Charke. What kinde of answere is this? Speake to the purpose, or confesse your insufficiencie. Basills owne woordes in this place doe euidently proue that hee is against you: answere them, or acknowledge your selfe not able to satisfie the Doctour.

Campion. Was all written, when the Apostles first taught?

Charke. Is this any answere to Basill? Propounde no newe questions, but answere the former place so full against you.

Camp. You see mine answere.

Charke. I see and all men may see your vntrueth to shift off the matter. Basills woordes are too strong against you. To your newe question, I answere, that since the woorde of God was first written, that which hath bene written, conteyned sufficient matter to saluation.

Campion.

Campion. Then what needed so many additions since, of the Prophets and Apostles writings, if we had sufficient before?

Charke. The most honourable addition of the Prophetes and Apostles serued to a clearer manifestation of Christ, of whome Moses had written before, but added nothing to the substance. Iohn. 5. 46.

Here Master Lieutenant signified the time was past.

The Question *Whether faith onely iustifieth.*

M. Charkes prayer.

OVr helpe is in the name of the Lorde, &c. Almightie God & merciful Father, we acknowledge against our selues, that we were conceiued and borne in sinne and corruption, that wee remaine vnprofitable to any thing that is good, and most prone and ready to that which is euill in thy sight. Ignorance doeth possesse our mindes, and dulnesse ruleth in our vnderstanding, so that of our selues wee can not see into thy glorious and excellent trueth: and in our selues wee finde no health, nor hope of health. Therefore, according to thy riche mercie, O Lord, take away our sinnes, and heale all our diseases, through the righteousnesse of Iesus Christ our onely saluation. Open our eyes we beseech thee, that wee may at this time beholde, and so frame our hearts, that we may gladly embrace thy most holy trueth as thou hast left it vnto vs, by thy holy seruants, the Prophets and Apostles. Graunt this knowledge and loue of thy trueth, with dayly increase, not onely to vs, O Lorde, who through thy grace alreadie make profession thereof, but also vnto all those that yet set them selues against the same: that they acknowledging the trueth of thy word, may cleaue to it, forsaking all superstitious vanities: and seeing the all sufficient righteousnes & sacrifice of thy only Sonne, may lay hold of it, denying thē selues, & renouncing their own merites & falsly named righteousnes. Graunt vs these things, O heauenly Father, for thine onely sonnes sake Iesus Christ our alone sauiour & redeemer, in whose name we aske thē, praying as he hath taught vs: Our Father, &c.

Walker. We haue in the forenoone entreated of the Canonicall scriptures and of their sufficiencie. Now we haue to entreate of fayth: God graunt vs grace that we may see the trueth, and hauing fayth may rest in it to our endelesse comfort. Let vs before we enter into the matter, declare somewhat concerning the state of the question. We holde therefore that we are iustified by fayth onely, and that freely, no other woorkes concurring for that purpose. And yet we set not downe a bare and naked fayth, as our aduersaries charge vs. For we confesse that fayth, hope, and charitie are coupled and linked together, and that loue is the greatest.

But

But we affirme, that fayth onely is that instrument whereby we lay holde vpon the loue of God, which is the onely foundation of our saluation. By that title therefore, wee exclude all mens workes and vertues as meritorious, and onely looke to the merits of Christ.

Campion. I will declare to you my meaning also. We are agreed that God doth iustifie, and for Christes sake onely, through his grace, and through his mercie alone, through his Sacraments and through baptisme. Thus farre we agree: but herein we disagree. For we say, that when God doth iustifie, he doth giue vs of his grace three distinct giftes, fayth, hope, and charitie, and these are as three causes of iustification, and charitie a principall cause, which frameth the first act in vs. We say therefore, that as grace is put in vs in iustification, so also our righteousnesse is enlarged through good workes, and is inherent in vs. Therefore it is not true that God doeth iustifie by fayth onely.

Charke. Campion, you are not to vse your old sleight in running from the matter, and loading one thing vpon an other. The question is, whether we be iustified by faith onely: that is nowe τὸ κρινόμενον, and you are not to change the state of the question.

That which is in question, and to be decided.

Walker. Well, let your declaration stande for defence, although we agree not. For there are sundry causes of iustification, finall, and midle. But faith is the first thing in vs that receiueth iustification, and yet it is not of vs.

Camp. I graunt, that there are mo causes then one.

Walker. Well, though I be an olde man, and haue bene long from the vniuersitie, I meane yet to examine you in the grounds of these things, and to go with you from poynt to poynt, and so we shall find out our disagreement best. I pray you what is the Etymon of fayth?

Camp. It is called fayth, *Quia fit quod dictum est*, Because it is performed that is spoken, as I take it.

Walker. That is true, *Dicitur a fiendo, quia Dominus fidelis est*, Because the Lorde is faithfull, standing to his worde and keeping his promise with vs. But in vs, faith is a certaintie or sure perswasion, and therefore it is called by the Apostle ἔλεγχος or

elenchus, foundation or argument. It is therefore the ground, and before all other things that come after it, as the foundation is before the building.

Campion. I grant it: But what inferre you hereof?

Walker. This I inferre. Faith is the grounde and before all things that come after it: Ergo it is before hope and charitie.

Camp. In nature it is before them, but it doth not iustifie before they do come.

Walker. *Prius* and *posterius*, First and last, bee taken diuers wayes. It is not before *Tempore*, but *Dignitate & ordine*: Not in time, but in dignitie and order.

Camp. That is contrarie to S. Paul: For he sayth, *Charitas est maior*, Loue is greater.

Walker. You must vnderstand what Paul meaneth thereby. It is *Maior duplici respectu*: It is greater in a double respect. In respect of God, and in respect of men, and so extendeth further.

Camp. Very well: I like your causes well, but it is simplie greater, and more excellent.

Walker. Let me proceede then. It is greater in that it is more necessarie to the life of man, and also in diuturnitie, because it neuer dieth, nor hath any ende.

Camp. I grant you all this. But what are those to the matter of iustification? But let me adde a thirde also, that it is *dignior*, because faith and all good workes are nothing without loue. But let vs heare your argument.

Walker. The ground is before that which is grounded vpon it, and in all good order we vse to set the most worthie first: Thus therefore I reason.

Faith is the foundation: ergo before the other.

Camp. If you meane in dignitie, it is not true. It is before in order, but not in dignitie. For the roote is not more worthie then the tree, though it be afore it.

Walker. Paul sayth *fundati & radicati in fide*, speaking of the assurãce they had in their saluation. And it was necessarie they should be thus grounded and rooted in the faith, before they could bring forth the fruits of faith. The fruits were good workes, which were not the cause of their iustification, but the effects of men, engraffed

graffed in Christ & iustified already: this roote was before ỹ fruit.

Camp. I graunt, as before: In order, but not in worthinesse. For the fruit is more worthie then the roote.

Walker. *Omnis causa efficiens est dignior effectu.* Euerie efficient cause is more worthie then the effect.

Camp. I deny that faith is the efficient cause of good works. It is a cause antecedent, but not efficient. But we are agreed vpon this. Let vs go to another argument.

Walk. Very well, it is called ἔλεγχος a sure argument of things that are not seene: a thing vndoubted.

Camp. Where is the place? It is called the foundation of euerlasting life, and an argument of things not seene, because I knowe it is by no other argument but by fayth. But what inferre you?

Walker. You shall heare anon. What is *Subiectum fidei*, the subiect of fayth? and what is *Obiectum fidei*, the obiect of fayth? *In quo versatur fides & circa quod:* In what and about what is fayth occupied?

Camp. *Subiectum fidei*, The subiect of faith, is man: to whom God hath giuen the gift of fayth, and thereupon man is denominate faythfull.

Walker. Doth man consist of one part or more?

Camp. Man doth consist of bodie and soule.

Walker. Whether doe I receyue fayth into my bodie or soule chiefly?

Camp. Fayth is receyued into the soule by the instrument of the bodie.

Walker. What part of the soule is it receyued by? For the soule hath diuers *potentias*, faculties. Receyue we it *per memoriam, voluntatem*, or *intellectum:* by the memorie, will, or vnderstanding?

Campion. I answere, the soule doth receiue it *per intellectum*, by vnderstanding illumined by fayth, because that part was properly corrupted by errour.

Walker. Why then, *Intellectus humanus* is *subiectum fidei in quo versatur*, and so *intellectu nos cognoscimus deum:* Mans vnderstanding is the subiect in which faith is, and so, by the vnderstanding we know God.

Camp. *Intellectu illuminati per fidem cognoscimus.* I grant we know God, our vnderstanding being illumined by fayth.

Walker. And what now is *obiectum fidei*, The obiect of faith?

Camp. *Obiectum fidei*, is trueth inspired from God.

Walker. Whether it be inspired or no, Trueth is *Obiectum* still. *Æterna veritas est deus*, ergo *Deus est obiectum fidei, promissio Euangelij.* Gods worde and his trueth is the obiect of fayth, and so sayth Thomas of Aquine, one of your owne doctours.

Camp. It is no obiect to me, till I looke to it. God as he is to be knowen, is the obiect of fayth, and as he is to bee loued, of charitie.

Walker. It is true: but God is incomprehensible, and wee knowe so farre of him as he hath reuealed of himselfe, as in creating to be Almightie, in gouerning to be wise, in preseruing to be true, and helping to be good, and in his promises to be sure and true: and so much he hath reuealed of himselfe. And this to apprehend, is sufficient to saluation.

Camp. To apprehend these things effectually, so that we also obey his commandements, and not onely to graunt them to be true, but also to apply these things to our selues through the passion of Christ, this is saluation and sufficient.

Walker. *Hactenus conuenit.* Hitherto we agree. But Paul Rom. 4. writeth: *Non hæsitans fide, & nititur promissione.* Not doubting in fayth, and leaning vpon the promise. So that there were two things: the promise, which must be beleeued that it is true, and the power of God, that he is able to performe.

Camp. *Concedo*, I grant it. And that made the fayth of Abraham to be fruitfull and meritorious.

Walker. What, meritorious? But that is *Perergon.* I will come neerer to the matter. You will graunt likewise, that hope hath *suum subiectum, & obiectum*, her subiect, and obiect.

Camp. Yea that I will, & that it is in the same soule of man, but more properly *in voluntate & affectu*, then in *Intellectu*, in the will and affection, then in the vnderstanding.

Walker. That is verie true. Nowe tell me what is *Obiectum spei*, The obiect of hope.

Camp. The good of the life to come.

Walker.

Walker. But what was the obiect especially of Abrahams hope?

Camp. The same that is common to all other men, but seorsum: the comming of Christ the Messias, promised to him and his seede after him.

Walker. What commoditie is promised to vs in Christ?

Campion. Saluation, which is to haue eternall life with Christ.

Walker. This promise being beleeued and knowen by fayth, is looked for by hope, and euery Christian man hath a great desire to this saluation promised. Either he hath or should haue, as Saint Paul, *Cupio dissolui & esse cum Christo*, I desire to bee loosed, and to be with Christ.

Camp. When God hath enlightened his heart by charitie, then he hath that desire stedfast.

Walker. Well, then I will leaue the obiect of hope, and come to the subiect of charitie. What is the subiect of charitie?

Camp. The affection of man.

Walker. What is the obiect?

Camp. It is God as he is beloued, *quatenus appetitur propter se.*

Walker. Very good. Then you see the foundation and causes with the whole order of our iustification: what neede all the worlde haue any more, but first to beleeue these things, next to looke for that which we hope for, thirdly to loue him who hath made vs this promise, and hath giuen vs these great benefites. Nowe see whether we are iustified by faith alone, or faith, hope, and charitie. But I leaue the prosecuting of this to Master Charke.

Camp. I graunt that this is the order of our iustification, wherein these do ioyntly concurre and worke together.

Charke. You may not auoyde the poynt and issue of the question, as you did in the forenoone, which is, that Faith onely iustifieth. It is a chiefe question, and you cannot carrie the matter so vprightly betwixt the olde Popery and the newe, but we shall easily finde you out: you say, fayth onely doeth not iustifie, but with faith, hope and charitie also are requisite, as causes and merits of our iustification. This is your cunning and newe Poperie to

mention onely hope and charitie: yet vnder these wordes you carry the olde Poperie, which addeth popish shift, penance, pilgrimages and other satisfactions: all which you would match with the death of Christ, if you might recouer your kingdome. But I haue to proue against you, that Fayth onely doeth iustifie, without these merits and workes which you adde, as though the righteousnesse of Christ were not inough.

Camp. I denie it: for you haue it not in all the word of God, that faith onely doeth iustifie.

Charke. Surely if you acknowledge any doctrine to be true in all the Scripture, this of iustification by faith onely, will be proued most true: if any plaine, this will appeare most plaine. And thus I proue it.

1. Argu. Euery doctrine, the substance and sense whereof is conteined in Scriptures, is true:

But the substance and sense of this doctrine, Fayth onely doth iustifie, is conteined in Scriptures:

Therefore this doctrine Faith onely doeth iustifie, is true.

Camp. I answere that this proposition Fayth onely doeth iustifie, is not to be founde in all the worde of God: and therefore I denie the Minor.

Charke. I haue affirmed in my Minor that the substance and sense of this proposition Faith onely doth iustifie, is conteined in the Scriptures. For proofe hereof I haue in the worde of God eleuen places all negatiue, excluding workes in the matter of our saluation. Namely Rom. chap. 9. verse 11. where the Apostle saith, Not of workes. Againe chap. 11. ver. 6. Not of workes. Also Galat. 2. ver. 16. Not of workes. Moreouer Rom. 4. 6. Without workes. Chap. 3. ver. 21. Without the Lawe. And so in the rest.

Eleuen places of scripture expresly excluding works from being causes of our iustification.

Camp. Let me answere them.

Here the rest of the places were demaunded by them that wrote, and by others.

Charke. Turne further to these places. Rom. chap. 3. verse 20. chap. 4. verse 13. Ephe. 2. vers. 8. and verse 9. 2. Tim. 1. 9. Tit. 3. 5. beside some other.

Camp. I doe but request that I may answere them seuerally, for not one of them proueth your assertion.

Charke. If you answere any of them, I will subscribe to

your doctrine in this poynt. Tush Campion, you may not thinke to face out the matter with these bare wordes. Dare you say our iustification is partly of workes, when the holy Ghost saith so often plainely and exclusiuely, Not of workes: Without workes: Not of the lawe, but without the lawe? Herein I challenge you that make challenge against the trueth, & will proue that this weightie and great cause, which may worthily be called the soule of the Church, is directly and plainely set downe in all these places. Denie it if you can.

Camp. Bring one of the eleuen places.

Charke. What say you to the Apostles conclusion Rom. 3. verse 20? Therefore by the deedes of the lawe, no flesh shall be iustified.

Camp. Will you giue me leaue to answere, and to speake somewhat generally to this?

Charke. You haue a particular place, make a particular answere, plainely and to the issue: roue not in generall discourses, that come not neere the marke.

Camp. The meaning of Saint Paul in such places, is to exclude the Iewes Ceremonies. For the Iewes asseuering the obseruation of the lawe, the keeping of their sacrifices and ceremonies, as Circumcision, &c. to be necessarie to saluation: S. Paul informeth the Gentiles that these things were not so necessarie, but faith was sufficient. This he vrgeth throughout the Scripture: So that fayth is vrged, but not fayth onely. Againe, by faith is meant all Christianitie and the whole religion of Christians, which is sufficient, without any parcell of the Iewes religion. This is one generall consideration, why Paul so often vrgeth fayth, throughout the Epistle to the Romanes, and else where. Another generall consideration is, for that the wise men of the Gentiles did alledge their moralities as a cause of their election, which Paul in the same Epistle stoode specially vpon, and meant to confute, as is afore sayde.

By Campions owne answere the Apostle speaketh of faith onely.

Here againe it appeareth by his answere that the Apostle teacheth faith onely.

Charke. Whether of these two interpretations you will allowe, it followeth by your owne exposition, that the Apostle concluding for faith against workes, concludeth that it is Faith onely that iustifieth: shutting out all such workes as are opposed vnto it. Now whereas you say that the workes opposite to faith, are

onely either the morall workes of the Gentiles, or the Ceremoniall of the Iewes: I will easily ouerthrowe the distinction.

Camp. Ouerthrowe it then.

Charke. First, there was neuer any such errour mainteined in the Church, that the morall workes of the Gentiles shoulde iustifie: therefore Paul neuer laboured so much and so often to confute that errour which did not trouble the Church. As for the Ceremonial workes, the Apostles writing to the Ephesians, not infected with the obseruation of Iewish ceremonies, had no cause to barre ceremoniall workes from iustification. Therefore he teacheth that all the workes of the faithfull, euen of Abraham, are excluded from being causes of iustification, and not Ceremonies onely, or the moralities of heathen men, as you imagine against the Apostles argument and scope in those places.

Camp. The generall scope of Saint Paul, is to exclude all workes both of Iewes and Gentiles in that Epistle: but in the way of discourse, I denie not, but incidently an other answere is to be giuen.

Nothing to the matter.

Charke. This last part of your speach is ἀπροσδιόνυσον: the first doeth grant all that I desire.

Camp. He excludeth the precedent workes of Abraham.

Charke. The ende why works are secluded from iustification doeth proue for me: for the Apostle in that place sheweth the finall counsaile & purpose of the Lorde, to be farre otherwise then you suppose. And to remember my promise of Syllogismes, I will proue it by the very forme of the Apostles wordes.

Argum. 2.

The ende and the meanes differ not:

The ende of our iustification was to exclude all workes precedent or consequent from being causes of iustification:

Therefore the meanes also must exclude euen all workes precedent and consequent, going before, or comming after.

Camp. The ende was not, to exclude all workes consequent.

Charke. Whatsoeuer it was wherein Abraham might glorie, that was excluded from iustification:

But in workes consequent or following he might glorie:

Therefore they also and all other workes whatsoeuer, first and last, are secluded and can be no cause or piece of cause, in our iustification.

Camp.

Camp. The example of Abraham, proueth that Abraham was iust before the couenant of Circumcision, and so, before the lawe of Moses was giuen: and therefore he inferreth that the Iewes must not glorie of iustification through their lawe and by the ceremonies thereof, seeing their father Abraham was iust before circumcision, and therefore circumcision not necessarie to iustification. But though workes voyde of Christ are nothing, yet through grace they serue to iustification.

Charke. Is this your way to answere Syllogismes, to tell a tale of your owne, and expounde newe matter, leauing the question? Answere shortly.

Abraham hath nothing left to glorie in:

Therefore all workes whatsoeuer are excluded: and so, faith onely iustifieth.

Camp. That is another place.

Charke. Answere it then, be it another, or the same.

Camp. The Apostle meaneth to shewe that Abraham was iustified by workes done in grace, and not by workes without expectation of Christ, or voide of Christ.

Charke. An open contradiction to the holy Ghost: note it. The Apostle (saith Master Campion) proueth that Abraham was iustified by workes. I reply against you with a double argument. First, Abraham had all his workes of Christ, for hee was faithfull: therefore the workes excluded, are workes wrought in grace. Secondly, he speaketh not of him as of an infidel, but as being the father of beleeuers: Therefore the Apostle excludeth not workes without expectation of Christ as you speake. Answere it, Campion.

Camp. I answere, that no workes of Abraham are excluded.

Charke. And I haue proued that all are excluded: and you can neither answere the syllogisme, nor satisfie the place of Saint Paul. The text and argument is cleare.

If Abraham were iustified by any workes, he had wherein to glorie:

But he could not glorie in any thing, (for that were absurde by the Apostles reason:)

Therefore there were no workes of merite or iustification in him.

Camp. This is the Apostles reason. All the good workes of Abraham were founded in Christ, and by these good workes he was iustified: therefore he was iustified by Christ. For if he had bene iustified by other workes excluding Christ, he might haue gloryed, and not bene iustified by Christ.

The very worde.

Charke. I can go no further in this argument. For τὸ ῥητὸν is against you, that is, the plaine text and argument. Also I aduow it and make all this companie witnesses, that you haue vttered in these straytes, plaine contradictorie propositions. The Apostle proueth that Abraham was iustified by workes, he leaueth nothing for Abraham to glorie in: but you leaue wherein he may both glorie, and iustifie him selfe. You haue also said the precedent workes of Abraham were excluded, and (which is the contradictorie) ẏ no workes of Abrahã were excluded. These things are very bad, which I the rather repeate, to lay open your contradictions for some that I thinke are present, & looke for no such weakenesse in their Champion.

Camp. What needs you aduowe? I aduowe the contrarie. And I say, that Abraham was iustified by good workes in Christ.

Charke. There is no such worde in Paul, but the contrary very often. Therefore your affirmatiue is contrarie to the holy Ghostes often repeated negatiue, Not of workes, Without workes.

Camp. I say you must repent before you die, or else you shall finde what it is to charge me with that which is not true. A particular example must haue a particular answere. His workes be not to his glorie, because his worke were foũded in Christ, therefore Christ must be all to his glorie. Abraham was already iust and in the fauour of God, before these things were saide, and so being iust, he was made more iust: and so first iust, and afterward iustified, and was not iustified by workes that went before his iustification, but being already iust, was made more iust by workes. And this was one of his good workes, *Credidit deo*, he beleeued in God: and to say the Creede is a meritorious worke: and the worke of faith, is a worke.

Charke. These discourses you might well haue spared, and framed a short answere to my argument. For yet you answere

not

not the Apostles negatiue, which ouerthroweth both your affirmatiue & your distinction, contradictorie to the Apostles wordes. For, to be iustified without workes, as the Apostle saith, and to be iustified by workes, as you say, are contradictorie: if your words be true, the Apostles are false. But seeing I can haue nothing for answere but indirect speaches, or wordes full of contradiction: I will giue place a while.

Walker. We that be the children of Abraham, and Christians, are iustified by the same faith that Abraham was iustified:

But Abraham was iustified by faith onely, and by nothing else:

Therefore we are iustified by faith, and by nothing else: that is, by faith onely.

Camp. I answere to the Maior: As Abraham being a iust man, was made more iust by a liuing faith: so the children of Abraham being alreadie iustified, encrease their righteousnesse by a liuing faith.

Walker. Doe you thinke that we are borne of our parents, as the sonnes of Abraham, or as the sonnes of Adam? Are we iustified by the same meanes that Abraham was, or no?

Camp. Yea, by the same meanes.

Walker. But Abraham was iustified by faith onely: therefore we.

Camp. I denie the Antecedent.

Walker. Paul saith, *Sed robustus factus est fide, &c.* Rom. 4. *Imputatum est illi ad iustitiam.* And whether did faith giue credite to the promise of GOD, whose proper and onely office it is?

Campion. To giue credite to the promise is the proper office of faith: but to giue credite to the office of God effectually, is the office both of faith and charitie.

Walker. In the office of giuing credite, you adde that which is not in the text.

Camp. It must needes be vnderstoode, because the Apostle speaketh of Abraham alreadie iustified, which had not bene possible, if he had not had faith and charitie.

Walker. What made him giue glorie to God? *Robustus factus fide, dedit gloriam deo.* Being made strong in faith, he gaue glorie to God.

Campion. The good worke gaue glorie to God: For it was a good worke in Abraham.

Charke. I will vse another Argument.

3. Argum. Whosoeuer is iustified, is iustified *ex formula*, according to the tenour eyther of the first or of the seconde couenant, (for there are but two couenants:)

But no man is iustified according to the tenour of the first couenant, which is by the workes of the lawe:

Therefore by the forme or tenour of the seconde, which is by Faith onely.

Camp. I graunt all in this sense: By Faith onely, not as Faith is distinct from charitie, but as faith is distinct from the olde lawe: so that the worde onely, doeth exclude all things impertinent to faith, and include all things inherent to faith.

Charke. Wordes. I will proue them to be but wordes, following my argument. The charter or stipulation of the first co-
Gal.3.11.&12. uenant is, Doe this, and thou shalt liue: of the seconde, The righteous man shall liue by Faith: Therefore this forme of speach in the Couenant, excludeth your implication and all ioyning of workes with faith.

Campion. I answere, that the Formula of the seconde couenant, is Christ.

Charke. You vnderstande not then what Formula is.

Camp. Teach me then.

Charke. I will teach you. Christ, I graunt, is the cause and author of the couenant of saluation: but the forme or tenour of a couenant are *concepta & stata verba*, the set and standing wordes, whereby the condition and issue of the couenant is expressed. For example, of the first couenant published in Sinai, this is the forme: *Hoc fac & vines*, Doe this and thou shalt liue: of the seconde out of Sion, this: *Iustus ex fide viuet*, The iust shall liue by faith: which is in effect, Beleeue this and thou shalt liue.

Campion.

Campion. The seconde couenant is all the religion of Christ, which includeth faith, hope, and charitie. For otherwise the Eucharist were excluded. He meaneth therefore by fayth, all obedience.

Charke. This is expressely against the Apostles doctrine and argument, Galat. 3. vers. 11, 12. who there proueth, that faith and workes are opposite causes of saluation.

Camp. The second couenant is, that we shall be saued by doing those things that Christ commanded: and the first couenant was by doing all that Moses commanded. And this is the very interpretation and meaning of the Apostle, The righteous shal liue by faith, that is, by faith of Christ.

Charke. A false position. I pray you, is obedience the faith of Christ? Is it faith to fulfil that which Christ commandeth, or not rather, to beleeue that he hath promised and performed?

Camp. Yea, that it is.

Charke. How can that be, seeing the Apostle Galat. 3. vers. 12. doth not onely set downe the two couenantes in Sinai and Sion, with their seuerall forme of words, but addeth plainely, The lawe is not of fayth, and maketh woorkes and faith opposite causes of iustification: teaching that hee that is iustified by Christ is not iustified by workes: and he that is iustified by works, looseth the benefite of Christ. Your wordes therefore must haue a thirde couenant, that the righteous man liueth partly by faith, and partly by workes, or else they cannot stande. Galat. 3. 12.

The church of Rome must find a 3. couenant, partly by workes, partly by faith (which was neuer made:) or they must admit the second, which is faith onely.

Camp. I answere to this, The lawe is not of faith: that is, the lawe as it is a naked commandement, is a burthen, and so it is not of faith, that is, it doth not giue the iustice which we haue by faith of Christ.

Charke. You haue giuen a false and grosse interpretation: and thus I proue it. If your distinction bee good, then there is either a third couenant, or the couenant of the lawe is mixed with the couenant of the Gospell: But no man will say that there is a thirde couenant, and the Apostle proueth ꝑ in ꝑ work of our iustification the couenant of the lawe doeth no way participate with the couenant of faith: therefore your distinction, saying, as it is a burden, is not good, and your interpretation, absurd and false.

Camp. I answere to the Minor, that the law is considered two

maner of wayes. The couenant of the lawe, as it is of the lawe, is no way mixed with the couenant of the Gospell: but as it is the couenant of the lawe eternall, of the lawe morall, of the lawe of nature, it is mixed with the new testament, & Christ hath renued it in the lawe of charitie. Moses gaue it one way: and Christ another. Moses the lawe maker: and Christ the lawe giuer. *Præceptum nouum do vobis, vt diligatis inuicem.* I giue you a newe commandement, that ye loue one another.

Charke. What absurde speaches are these, to make a substantiall distinction of the lawe in regarde of the minister, or of the time? The morall lawe and commandement of God is euermore the same in substance.

Camp. I vnderstande not what you meane. I say it is mixed: but as it is mixed, it is not called Moses law, but ꝑ law of Christ, who gaue it more perfectly.

Charke. Againe, I say this is absurde: for the lawe of God was alway the lawe of God: and therefore the same, and exacteth the same obedience: which because no man can performe, no man can liue thereby.

Camp. You are still gathering absurdities.

Charke. I must gather them where you scatter them. For what materiall difference can there be made of one and the same thing? The second couenant offreth life, onely by faith in Christ: the former onely by workes: and these cannot be confounded, as you confounde and huddle them together. Thus your answeres are from the arguments.

Camp. My answeres are to the purpose. What is it that you would haue more of me?

Charke. Is your answere to the purpose, that mixeth & con-
Galat. 3. 11, 12. foundeth the two couenants, which are so opposite by ꝑ Apostles place alleadged, that he which cleaueth to the one, can receiue nothing by the other? For the couenant of the lawe can beare no transgression: and to iustifie vs, the couenant of faith needeth no satisfaction or woorkes on our part, Christ hauing most fully wrought and satisfied for vs. Therefore, it is the pride of man to thinke, and the errour of man to teach, that the righteousnesse of Christ is not sufficient without addition of our righteousnesse.

Camp. Well, shewe mee but that negatiue *sola*, onely, in all

the

the Scriptures.

Charke. This is a newe matter: I would haue the olde first satisfied.

Camp. Shewe it me: can you not shewe it?

Charke. Seeing you would shift off the former argument by crauing a newe: I am contented to proue that exclusiue terme, which you call negatiue.

Whatsoeuer excludeth all other causes in iustification, that remayneth a sole cause: Argumẽt. 4.

Faith excludeth all other causes in iustification:

Faith therefore remaineth a sole and onely cause.

Camp. Proue your Minor.

Charke. The absolute negatiues so often repeated in ỹ scripture, Not of workes: Without workes: Not of the law: Without the lawe: do plainely exclude all other causes.

Camp. Will you by this argument exclude all causes besides faith? Then with good woorkes you will also exclude the mercy of God. What is your meaning?

Charke. What a vanitie is there in this question? Understand you not that I speake onely of causes in vs, excluding no former causes, as the eternall decree and loue of God, the obedience and righteousnesse of Christ?

Camp. Proue that *Sola fides*, onely faith is in the scripture.

Charke. I haue proued it: and why do you not answere the argument?

Camp. What argument would ye haue me answere?

Charke. The last. All other causes in vs are excluded by the woorde of God, where it is sayde so often, Not of workes: Not of the lawe: therfore *Sola fides*, faith onely remaineth, by many testimonies of the Scriptures.

Campion. This *fides* is Christian obedience, and hath good woorkes.

Charke. I graunt, as the good tree hath good fruite necessarily, so fayth hath good woorkes: but these good woorkes, though they be not separated from fayth, are yet separated from being any cause of iustification with faith. As light, though it bee not separated from fire, yet it is separated from the force of burning: for the heate burneth, and not the light of fire.

Camp.

Campion. But where proue you that *sola*, onely, is in the Scripture?

Charke. My argument hath fully and plainly proued it: you neither will nor can answere it. Therefore to proue it againe, because the text Deut.6. hath the negatiue, Thou shalt serue no strange gods: Christ Mat.4. addeth the worde ONELY, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him ONELY shalt thou serue. So we by the same warrant and word, doe in this question of iustification take these words, Not by works, Not by the law, to import as much as faith onely: for al workes whatsoeuer, being excluded by these negatiue speaches, faith alone remaineth.

Indefinite propositions taken generally Gal.1.ver.1. Not of men, that is, Not of any man. Not of workes, that is, Not of any workes: So all workes are excluded whatsoeuer they be.

Camp. Why, doth he say, Thou shalt worship by faith onely?

Charke. I had hedged you in before, that you should not leape ouer to run at large in your bie questions. I said, Christ Matth.4. thus alleadged against the tempter, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serue. This negatiue ONLY is not in Moses, yet added by Christ for interpretations sake, to expound words importing it, as I haue saide before: & so do we in the matter of iustification, finding all righteousnes by workes or by the lawe so oftentimes excluded, do conclude thereupon, that faith onely doth iustifie.

Camp. The word *adorabis* doth of necessitie infer so much, and therefore Christ doth well to expound it by onely. But the worde iustifie doeth not necessarily inferre the excluding of workes. And therefore you do not well to inferre, faith onely iustifieth.

Charke. What, do you not blush to bring this strange & false distinction against a cleare truth of God? Or will you ouerthrow a maine pillar of Poperie for auoiding the force of one poore argument? Doth the word *adorabis* exclude al other creatures, and necessarily inforce that God alone must be worshipped? Thē Cāpion condemneth al images, all adoration of the crucifix, all inuocation & worshipping of saintes. For to adore or to worship (saith he) importeth that adoration & worship is due to God only: & so he excludeth al creatures frō worship, euen the crucifix that they say must haue the adoration done to it, which is due to Christ himself.

Canisius in Catech. Payn. Andr. lib.9 Orthodox. Expl.

Camp. What needeth al this? it foloweth not which you say. There is much differēce betwene to adore & to reuerēce or serue. For *latria* or to adore is due to God onely, and *dulia* to serue, is

that

that which I may yeeld to any Saint, or creature.

Charke. Yes, the speach needeth, and the argument foloweth. For your verball distinction of Greeke wordes to deceiue English people, is vnlearned and impious, to saye λατρεία is for God onely, (which yet, as I sayde, you allowe to the bare image of Christ) and δουλεία for Images. Can all knowe and keepe a iust weight and measure in their deuotions, giuing no more but iust δουλείαν to saintes? To bee short, the errour and vnlearnednesse of your distinction appeareth, that not vnderstanding the vse and proper signification of the worde δουλεία, you haue allowed it to be giuen to Images, being a worde that noteth as base and as slauish bondage as any worde in the Greeke tongue: so by your distinction ỹ worshippers of your Church must be as bondmen to their Images. Thus you see (onely) is gathered fiftly of the negatiue, and that your distinction is both false, and also against your owne doctrine of Image worship.

Campion. I saye it is gathered from both, and the negatiue not sufficient alone, but because of the matter speaking of God.

Charke. Why then I perceiue you will borrowe of me for a neede. Before, you said *Adorabis* included onely, nowe you come to me, and say it is gathered also of the negatiue. This is al I can desire.

Camp. Fayth onely as it is a good worke, ioyned with hope and charitie, doeth iustifie.

Charke. I woulde not haue you to abuse the companie, in graunting Fayth onely, and yet you will expounde it, Fayth not alone. It is a straunge onely, that is not alone. Furthermore, Fayth as it is a good woorke, doeth not iustifie, being alwayes imperfect, but as it apprehendeth the righteousnesse of Christ which is perfect: that is, as it is a piece of obedience to the Lawe of God, it doeth not iustifie, but as it apprehendeth the precious promises.

Campion. You are still charging mee with abusing the compane: but if you will giue mee leaue, I will declare howe fayth is a woorke. There is an habite, which is called *Fides*, and the act of this habite within a man is *credere*, to beleeue, an act interior proceeding from this habite. An act exterior proceeding

ding from this habite, is to profesſe this fayth conſonant to the Apoſtle, With the heart I beleeue, and with the mouth I confeſſe. Nowe, I ſaye, to beleeue, is fyrſt a good woorke: and to profeſſe this fayth, is alſo a good woorke. As to giue an almes, to faſt, to doe penance, &c. and this fayth Abraham had. And your ſaying is contrary to Saint Iames, *Abraham pater noſter nonne ex operibus iuſtificatus eſt, offerens filium ſuum Deo?* Abraham our father, was he not iuſtified by woorkes, offering vp his ſonne to God?

Charke. My ſaying is not contrary to Saint Iames: but your obiection is ἔξω λόγε, farre from the queſtion in hande. Wee diſpute what be the cauſes of ſaluation, and you runne out to the notes and effects of him that is iuſtified.

Campion. Let me oppoſe. Is it not reaſon that I ſhoulde oppoſe?

Charke. Yes, when you are thereto appoynted: and you ſhall fynde enowe to anſwere you. Yet becauſe you haue ſo often chalenged vs to anſwere you an argument, though I come not with any commiſſion to ſuffer you to proue your erronious doctrine: I will notwithſtanding, ſuffer you to oppoſe and make an argument in this matter. Firſt giuing the companie to vnderſtande, that you woulde deceiue them with an opinion that our aduantage is great in replying: but it is not ſo. If your cauſe were good and your ſkill great, you might make it harder to reply, then to anſwere. For the anſwerer may with a worde deny the propoſition, and ſo, ſoone take from the replyer all his weapons. But make your argument.

Here Campion pauſed long, before he coulde frame his argument. Whereupon Maſter Charke ſayde, a Syllogiſme, Campion, a Syllogiſme. Yet ſtaying longer, Maſter Charke ſayde, We ſhall haue it anone.

Camp. Syllogiſme. Camp. He that was iuſtified for beleeuing, was iuſtified by a good woorke:

But Abraham was iuſtified by beleeuing:

Ergo Abraham was iuſtified by a good woorke. The Maior is out of Saint Iames, Chap. 3. *Suppleta eſt Scriptura, dicens*

cens, &c.

Charke. Proue your Maior in the sense we dispute of, and I wil answere you to two other Syllogismes.

Camp. It is easely proued.

Charke. Howe can you proue it out of Saint Iames, that fayth is a good worke? When Saint Iames sayeth, Abraham was iustifyed by good workes, his meaning is, that Abraham is declared and knowen to be iust according to that phrase, Wisedome is iustified of her children. Againe, all the people and Publicans iustified God. Wisd. 11.19. Luke 7.29.

Campion. I will none of your interpretations: the question is cleare with me.

Charke. I woulde fayne haue of your answeres, so they were to the purpose of the argument.

Campion. Proceede, and proue somewhat for your cause.

Charke. I haue proued more then you can answere. And because you generally slaunder vs, that our doctrine concerning this, and other principall poyntes of religion, is against the Doctours: (although the Scriptures bee large, full and sufficient ynough, and are the onely touchstone for the tryall of sounde and true doctrine,) yet I will not sticke a little to followe you in this.

Cyprian, Basill, Ambrose, Theodoret, Hierome, Gennadius, all these Greeke and Latine Fathers, doe flatly and fully teache, that we are saued by fayth onely. Argu. 5.

Campion. Bring mee one of them, and I will answere you.

Charke. There is a notable place out of Basill Περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης, where, of purpose disputing of humilitie, among other notes hee sheweth, that wee must attribute all to the grace and rygh teousnesse of God, who alone is our glorie, our wisedome, and our iustification. Thereupon falling into this question, hee sayeth, a man must acknowledge him selfe voyde of true righteousnesse, and πίστει δὲ μόνῃ τῇ εἰς χριστὸν δεδικαιωμένον. That is, a man must knowe, that hee is iustified by onely fayth

in Christ. I English it to your hande, because you deale not with the Greeke.

Campion. I acknowledge your places: and yet your doctrine is vtterly newe. For the Fathers when they vrge that doctrine, they did it in respect they had to deale with Iewes and Infidels and Pagans. And further, by faith they meant Christian religion, excluding Paganisme, and not excluding charitie and good workes.

Charke. Our doctrine newe, and yet the auncient Doctours teache it? I aske with what conscience or iudgement you can saye it? Dyd the Apostle writing to the Romanes, to the Galathians, to the Ephesians, Churches so effectually called and reclaymed from Gentilisme, that he termeth thē Saintes and brethren, and affirmeth that they are no more darkenesse, but light in the Lorde: Did the Apostle (I say) writing to them, deale as against Iewes and Pagans? I maruayle you blush not at so fowle a shift and so palpable an errour. But will you not vouchsafe the Doctours an answere? shall they be sent away before they haue receiued their answere?

Rom.1.7. Galat.1.2. Ephe.1.1.& 5.8

Camp. They wrote vpon occasion against an heretike, hauing affiance in workes.

Charke. Be it so: then they write aswell against Papists, hauing affiance in workes.

Camp. They had affiance in workes done without Christ, and are therefore reproued by the Fathers.

Charke. This is onely sayde, to shake them all off with one false distinction. Agayne, it was a straunge occasion you speake of, that made the Fathers write an vntrueth. But rather you are straunge to expounde them directly against their wordes, saying, Faith onely doeth iustifie. I could here helpe you with a better answere, which the better learned on your side vse to this obiection.

Camp. It was the heresie, that most troubled Christians in the Primitiue Church.

Charke. This is a newe question, and in doubt. But howe will you euer bee able to proue that the Apostle disputing for iustification by fayth against iustification by woorkes, excludeth onely Paganisme? Answere this.

Camp.

Camp. I haue answered.

Charke. In deede you haue still somwhat to say, but not to answere that point of ỹ argument which most woundeth your cause. Therefore a Syllogisme against your shift.

The Apostle excludeth the morall Lawe from iustifying: Therefore your distinction is wast. Argu. 6.

Camp. But he excludeth not charitie and good workes.

Charke. What a But is that? Is there any charitie, or be there any good workes not conteyned vnder the morall and eternall Lawe of God? If the deedes of the morall Lawe be shut out from the causes of our iustification by S. Paul, what doore can you open to let them in againe?

Camp. I say, charitie and good workes are not excluded.

Charke. And I say, this is still to begge the question, and not to answere the Argument. So your doctrine is sufficiently ouerthrowen.

Walker. Besides a great sort of places that Master Charke hath brought, Sadolet one of your owne, hath a plaine place in Epist. ad Rom. *Abraham attulit tantum fidem non sua opera.* And againe, *Quantum quisque affert de sua iustitia, tantum defert de diuina beneficentia. &c.* Abraham brought onely faith, not his workes.

Camp. It is but lost time that you alleadge Sadolet. Hee was but a man of late yeres, whose credite is not to be set against the determination of the whole Church: besides, his meaning was, that man should not trust in his owne workes. Howe much euerie man bringeth of his owne iustice, so much he taketh away of Gods goodnesse.

Walker. You will allowe no man, neither those that are against you, nor with you. But if he had dealt as soundly in other things as in this, he had bene to be striued withall. He sheweth by an apt similitude, that if a man take a Potte hauing some troubled water in it, and goeth to the cleare water to fill it, the troubled foule water in the potte doeth not become cleare, but rather troubleth and defileth the water which was cleare: Euen so, the more we bring of our owne, the lesse we attribute to God, and the lesse we receiue from God. Wee must bring nothing of our owne to God. It is troubled water, when we mingle our works and righteousnes with Gods.

Camp. Let the similitude be rehearsed. It is an apt similitude. He that commeth to be iustified by Christ must not bring

troubled water, but cleare: that is, those good workes that he did before, and those prayers that he made before, his morall deedes, his almes, his fasting, &c. For all the morall workes that are done before, they are troubled water: but those we doe afterwards, they are made cleare in the Passion of Christ, although they be not in all respects perfect.

Charke. I wil so proue that good workes haue no place in iustification, that you shall not be able to answere: and because the Doctors can haue no answere, I will returne to Scripture.

Argu. 7. Sanctification and iustification are two sundry things:

Therefore good workes, the fruites of sanctification, haue no place in iustification.

Camp. Make your Syllogisme.

Charke. Whatsoeuer is an effect of sanctification that followeth, is not a cause of iustification that went before:

But charitie and other good workes are effectes of sanctification which followeth:

Therfore they be no causes of iustification which goeth before. Answere if you can.

Camp. I deny that they are onely of sanctification: they are of both.

Charke. They be *disparata*, handled by the Apostle as diuers things: also the one, some degrees before the other. Therfore you doe euil to confound *priora & posteriora*, the effectes of the latter, with the causes of the former.

Camp. Is this the argument that can not be answered? I say, whosoeuer is iustified, is also sanctified: and so, good workes proceede from both.

Charke. Let all men marke the absurditie of this speache. If good workes proceede from sanctification, and sanctification from iustification, howe can good workes goe before them both, as a cause, seeing they come after both, as an effect? Thus you are entoyled.

Here was an open misliking of the answeres, and some speach of making an ende. Then M. Charke saide, I would faine vse one argument more, to turne Campion out of all his shiftes, and to let the company vnderstand his weakenes, and especially the weakenes of his cause.

Campion. Let vs heare what argument this is, whereof you make such bragges.

Charke. The authoritie and trueth of scriptures for my cause maketh me so confident. Therefore marke the argument well.

We are iustified by Imputation onely: Arg. 8.

Therefore by faith onely.

Camp. *Nego Maiorem.* I deny your Maior.

Charke. I proue the Maior, if you so call it.

Christ died onely by Imputation:

Therefore we liue onely by Imputation, and are consequently iustified by faith onely.

Camp. I deny the argument.

Charke. I proue it by Analogie.

Christ died onely through the imputation of our sinne:

Therefore if we liue, we liue onely by the imputation of his righteousnes.

And therfore, to say that we liue by any imputation of our owne good workes, is asmuch as to say, that Christ died by imputation of some of his owne sinne. For this analogie and proportion betwixt the causes of Christes death, and the causes of our life, doth necessarily hold, and must diligently be obserued.

Camp. I answere to your similitude.

Charke. If it be a similitude, it is by good analogie and demonstration of trueth out of the scripture. It is you that abuse the hearers with similitudes that are not *similia*: my argument is demonstratiue.

Camp. I answere then to your analogie. So farre as the scripture doth intend, it holdeth. Like as Christ did beare our sinnes, so we haue in vs the iustice of Christ. The righteousnes that we haue, is giuen vs by Christ. Christ had our sinnes by imputation onely, because hee was not capable of sinnes inherent. But we are capable of iustice inherent, which Christ doth giue vs, and therefore in vs we haue the iustice of Christ, both by imputation, and also inherent, giuen by him. And therefore it is called the iustice, *Non qua ipse iustus est, sed qua nos iustos fecit:* Not whereby he is iust, but whereby he hath made vs iust.

Walker. Sinnes inherent in vs, and righteousnes inherent in Christ?

Camp.

Camp. Nay, I say righteousnes inherēt in vs giuē by Christ.

Charke. Campion ye answere not the argument, but in place of answering you lay downe newe positions. Your inherent righteousnes is not graunted you: if it were, yet it followeth not that it should bee a fellowe cause in our iustification with Christes righteousnes.

Camp. I say we haue inherent righteousnes, and Christ had not inherent sinne.

Charke. What answere is this to my argument? If we had it, yet it followeth no more that it should iustifie vs, then the inherent sparke and light of nature which is least, should make vs able of our selues clearely to behold the hidden mysterie of the grace and mercie of God, reuealed onely by fayth in the Gospell.

Camp. Will you not admitte an answere?

Charke. You are graueled. It is no answere to bring a newe and false position, & that not applied to the argument. But I will not let you rest in this starting hole, you shall haue Syllogismes.

Our sinnes alone were of full sufficient force by imputation to condemne Christ vnto death:

Therefore his righteousnes alone is of full and sufficient force by imputation to iustifie vs vnto life. Againe, and shortly.

In Christ there was no inherent sinne to be any cause of his condemning:

Therefore in vs is no inherent righteousnes to be any cause of our iustifying.

Camp. I dispute not how he might haue iustified, but by what meanes he doth iustifie vs.

To trifle and shift by childish words.

Charke. This is plainely ἀδολεσχεῖν, to say the least. Answere the reasons. Doe my arguments proue howe he was able, or rather proue they not most manifestly howe he hath iustified vs? But as the Scribes & Pharisees supposed some inherent sinne in Christ, so you their successors, suppose some inherent righteousnes in vs: and we shall as truely liue by this, as he iustly dyed for that.

Campion. I deny the argument, because his will is otherwise.

Charke. Here againe is a newe proposition brought in place of an answere. But I haue proued that GOD hath done it: and therein reuealed his will which is most holy and most perfect in al proportion of iustice.

Camp.

Camp. I denie it. For we haue inherent righteousnes.

Charke. I would you would so answere, as men might see with what iudgement ye vse so many denials. But I will followe my argument, and proue there is no inherent righteousnes in vs, whereby we are more or lesse iustified.

If we haue any inherent righteousnes as a fellowe or helping cause of our iustification, then the righteousnes of Christ is not alone without vs so full and absolute to our saluation, as were our sinnes to cause his condemnation:

But Christs righteousnes alone without our inherent righteousnes, is de facto, as full and perfect euery way:

Therefore we are aswell de facto, iustified only by the imputation of his righteousnes, as he was condemned only for the imputation of our sinne.

Camp. I denie the Minor.

Charke. You deny it manifestly against the doctrine of the Apostle. Rom. 5. teaching that there was more force in the righteousnes of Christ to saluation, then was in our sinne to condemnation. Whereupon you are turned out of your shifts, and must confesse, that as Christ was condemned only for the imputation of our sinne, without any inherent sinne of his owne: so are we iustified onely by the imputation of his righteousnes, without any inherent righteousnes of ours. Which who so denieth, he shalbe found to match mans supposed righteousnes, with the righteousnes of God: and to exalt flesh and blood against the almightie.

Here Master Lieutenant signified the time was past.

Let vs conclude with prayer.

ALmightie God & most mercifull Father, we giue thee humble and heartie thanks in the name of Iesus Christ, for all thy goodnes, specially, for the alone & all sufficient sacrifice of Iesus Christ, beseeching thee, that renouncing all opinion of any righteousnes of our owne, we may by faith lay hold of his righteousnes to our euerlasting saluation. Also we thanke thee for the inestimable treasure and armour of thy holy word, whereby thou

makeſt thy children rich in all ſpirituall and heauenly wiſdome, inhabling them, euen the weakeſt of them, to triumphe againſt proud and bold ignorance, againſt the deceitfull and lying ſpirits gone out into the world in theſe laſt times, to deceiue thoſe that receiue not the knowledge and loue of thy trueth. Moreouer, good Lord, as it hath pleaſed thee to vouchſafe ſome bleſſing vpon our labours this day, for which we likewiſe giue thee thankes: ſo we beſeech thee yet further to bleſſe them, that the trueth may be more and more precious to thy children, and that they which are yet without, may either acknowledge the power and light of thy Goſpell, if they belong to thee: or being none of thine, may ſtand conuicted in their owne conſcience, as children of darkeneſſe, and haue their mouthes ſtopped, which they ſo open againſt the light and trueth of thy moſt holy word.

Graunt vs theſe things, O Lorde, and whatſoeuer elſe may ſerue to thy glory and our ſaluation, through Ieſus Chriſt our onely Lord and Sauiour, Amen.

I. Walker.

W. Charke.

GEO PEABODY
230
.2
.N861
1583
c.1

HG56508
19 J413

See Fuller, Worthies, London, pp 222-3.